Exhibit D

```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
   SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                           7:19-CR-497 (NSR)
 5
       -vs-
                                           BAIL HEARING
 6
   MATITYAU MOSHE MALKA,
  MORDECHAY MALKA, et al.
 8
                            Defendants.
 9
        *Proceedings recorded via digital recording device*
10
                                 United States Courthouse
11
                                 White Plains, New York
12
                                 April 19, 2022
13
14 Before:
15
                                 HONORABLE ANDREW E. KRAUSE,
                                 Magistrate Judge
16
17 APPEARANCES:
18
   DAMIAN WILLIAMS
19
        United States Attorney for the
        Southern District of New York
20 JAMES A. LIGTENBERG
        Assistant United States Attorney
21
22 JOSEPH A. VITA, ESQ.
        Standby Attorney for Pro Se Defendant, Matityau Moshe Malka
23
24 SUSAN C. WOLFE, ESQ.
        Standby Attorney for Pro Se Defendant, Mordechay Malka
25
```

```
1 ALSO PRESENT:
 2
   VINCENT ADAMS, U.S.P.O.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

3

```
1
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Good morning, your Honor.
                                                         Jim
   Ligtenberg for the Government.
 2
 3
             THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Ligtenberg.
 4
             MR. VITA: Your Honor, Matityau Moshe Malka is
   appearing pro se and I am standby counsel, Mr. Joseph Vita.
 6
             THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Vita. Good morning, Mr.
 7
   Malka.
 8
             THE DEFENDANT: Matityau Moshe Malka. Good morning,
   your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Malka.
11
             THE INTERPRETER: Stephen Zeger, standby Yiddish
   interpreter for the federal courts.
12
13
             THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Zeger.
14
             MR. WOLFE: Good morning, your Honor. Susan Wolfe,
   standby counsel for Mordechay Malka.
15
             THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Wolfe. Good morning,
16
  Mr. Malka.
17
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Good morning. Mordechay Malka,
18
19
   your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Good morning.
21
             Okay, my name is Magistrate Judge Krause.
                                                        It's nice
   to meet those of you who I have not met before.
22
23
             Let me just first start by saying you can see here
24
  that we do not have a court reporter in the courtroom here
```

today. That's pretty standard for appearances before magistrate

The proceeding is being recorded and judges, as you may know. it will be possible to create a transcript of today's proceeding if it's necessary for whatever reason. 4 Mr. Ligtenberg, I'll ask the Government to please order a transcript of the proceeding just in case it's necessary, and we'll see whether that needs to be done on an 7 expedited basis or whether it can be done for regular delivery depending on how things go today. 9 MR. LIGTENBERG: Will do, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 With that in mind, Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka in 12 particular, I will ask that when you address the Court, you make 13 sure to speak slowly and you speak into the microphone because 14 the recording system that we have in the courtroom only works properly through the microphones, so in order to make sure that 15 your arguments are heard and picked up properly for purposes of 16 17 creating a transcript, it's necessary to do what I'm doing here, 18 which is speak clearly and into the microphone. We can see as 19 we proceed today whether it will make more sense for you to 20 stand as you address the Court, which is typical, or whether for 21 purposes of a clear and accurate recording, it makes more sense 22 for you to stay seated so you can speak more clearly into the 23 microphone. We can evaluate that as we proceed today. 24 Okay? 25 MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes.

```
1
             THE COURT:
                         All right, I see you both nodding your
  heads, so thank you.
 2
             Let me also just start out here today by setting the
 3
  stage for what this proceeding is and what this proceeding
   isn't.
             First of all, I've received a lot of submissions from
 6
 7
   the both sides in advance of today's hearing and I have
   reviewed, heh, a lot of material, but not every single scrap of
   paper that I have received.
             From Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka, I received on Friday
10
   evening at approximately ten p.m., that is April 15th, a
11
12
   five-page letter dated April 15th, which I have read in its
13
   entirety, and approximately 360 pages of additional materials
14
   submitted by the defendants in support of their application here
   today. I have looked through all of those materials.
15
16
   read some of them. I have not read each and every page of those
   materials.
17
             Last night, in the evening, I received from the
18
   Government a letter which is on the docket at ECF no. 551.
19
                                                                Ι
20
   should have said that the defendants' submission is on the
   docket at ECF no. 546. The Government's submission is on the
21
22
   docket at ECF no. 551. It's a nine-page, single-spaced letter
23
   which I have read in its entirety, and there are approximately
24
   200 pages of transcripts and other materials attached to that
25
   letter. Again, I have looked at all of that material; I have
```

Román.

```
not read every single page of that material.
 2
             Some of those transcripts were of proceedings that Mr.
  Matityau Malka --
             I apologize if I mispronounce your name. Is that
 4
   close, Mr. Malka?
 6
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: It's a hundred percent correct.
 7
             THE COURT: Okay, can you say it again for me, please.
 8
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Matityau Malka.
 9
             THE COURT: Matityau?
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Malka.
10
11
             THE COURT: Malka.
12
             Malka I have, but Matityau, is that correct?
13
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, your Honor.
14
             THE COURT: Okay, thank you. And if I misstate that,
15
   I apologize, and please feel free to correct me.
             Several of the transcripts that were submitted by the
16
   Government, I believe two of the transcripts, were of
17
   proceedings that Mr. Matityau Malka participated in, so those
18
   would be proceedings that he at least would be familiar with,
19
20
   whether or not he has seen those transcripts or not, and many of
   the points raised in the Government's letter of last evening are
21
22
   points that have been raised at other proceedings in this case,
23
   specifically in advance of the two prior bail hearings that
24
  Matityau Malka participated in before Judge McCarthy and Judge
```

25

So I have reviewed the materials I've just described. 1 2 I've also reviewed the Pre-Trial Services reports for each defendant. Those were prepared on...February 3rd, 2021, in the case of Matityau Malka and back in...July of 2019 in the case of Mordechay Malka. I've also reviewed the current superseding indictment in this case, which is on the docket at 7 ECF no. 358. It's the third superseding indictment. So I've reviewed all of that material. 9 And it just bears repeating that what we are here for 10 today is a bail hearing, that is, to determine if there is any condition or combination of conditions that will reasonably 11 12 assure these defendants' appearance in court as required and the 13 safety of any other person and the community. We are not here to conduct a mini-trial on the merits of the Government's 14 allegations against these defendants. My understanding is that 15 this case is currently scheduled for trial on May 18th before 16 17 Judge Román, so approximately one month from today. be the opportunity for both sides to litigate the charges 18 19 against these defendants. 20 As in every case, the defendants are entitled -- every criminal case, the defendants are entitled to the presumption of 21 22 innocence. That applies for purposes of this proceeding as 23 well. At the same time, I am required by statute to consider as

part of the bail evaluation the nature and the circumstances of the offenses charged, the weight of the evidence against you,

your history and characteristics, and the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by your release. 4 Now, based on the submissions I have received, my understanding is that the Government may be willing to consent to the release of Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka as long as that release is subject to certain conditions that the Government believes are necessary to ensure the appearance of the defendants and the safety of the community. I also further 10 understand from the Government's submission that there is some additional information that the Government would need to have 11 12 before the Government can fully determine whether it will, in 13 fact, consent to the defendants' release. Specifically, as set 14 forth in Mr. Ligtenberg's letter last night, the Government does not currently understand what the defendants' proposal is with 15 respect to where they would live if they were released pursuant 16 17 to conditions, with whom they would live, and under what conditions. 18 19 Now, Mr. Ligtenberg, were there any other particular 20 pieces of information -- aside from the question of 21 whether ... aside from the question of whether the defendants will consent to some of the specific conditions that the Government 22 23 has proposed, are there any other pieces of information that the 24 Government needs to have from the defendants about the potential 25 bail package in order to evaluate whether or not the Government

Bail Hearing

USA v. Malka, et al.

```
would consent to release?
 2
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I think the only other thing I would
  mention, as your Honor knows, in the normal course, our office
   has a process by which we would approve co-signers, which often
   happens either before or after the release. I think we would
   want to dive into who the co-signers are as well.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
 8
             And just -- thank you, Mr. Ligtenberg.
 9
             Just to be clear, what Mr. Ligtenberg is referring to
   there is if there were financial conditions associated with the
10
   release, meaning that the release were subject to a certain
11
12
   unsecured bond, that bond typically, in almost every case, is
13
   co-signed by one or more, sometimes up to four or five,
14
   individuals who are either financially responsible individuals,
   people who have income such that -- or assets such that they
15
16
   could satisfy the bond if there were a violation of the
17
   conditions, or people who have what is referred to as moral
   suasion over the defendants, people who could help ensure that
18
19
   the defendants in question would appear at court appearances as
   required.
20
21
             And as Mr. Ligtenberg explained, in every case that
   I'm aware of, the Government has a process whereby it interviews
22
23
   these potential co-signers to assess whether they are, in fact,
24
   appropriate individuals to provide the financial assurances or
25
   moral suasion that is contemplated by the bond. That process
```

```
usually takes a couple of days, depending on the availability of
   the co-signers to meet with the Government, but the Government
   can generally make those interviews happen pretty quickly,
   especially in this day and age when a lot of those interviews,
   my understanding is, are taking place by video or telephone even
   if necessary.
 7
             Is that correct, Mr. Ligtenberg?
 8
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             Now, I'm just going to go off the record for a second
11
   and pause.
12
             I have a note here, Ms. Brown, the people who are
13
   trying to dial in to the conference line?
             (Off-the-record discussion)
14
15
             THE COURT: While you do that, Ms. Brown, let me just
   also add -- we can go back on the record for this.
             Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka, in nearly every case where
17
   defendants are seeking release on bail conditions, the
18
19
   defendants through their counsel, where they have counsel, will
20
   provide information for the Government to consider about the
21
   proposed bail conditions in advance of a bail hearing, and that
22
   information might include some of the things that Mr. Ligtenberg
23
  has referenced in his letter and that I have referenced here
24
   today, such as where you would propose to live upon release.
25
   That is because if you are released, it would be subject to the
```

```
supervision of the Pre-Trial Services Office of the Department
   of Probation and that information is necessary for Pre-Trial
   Services to evaluate and to be able to understand what the
   supervision would look like.
             So I understand that that information has not been
 5
  provided here. I just want you to understand that it is not at
   all atypical or unusual for the Government to request this
   information and, in fact, it's necessary for the Court to have
   that information in order to evaluate whether release subject to
10
   conditions is appropriate.
11
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Your Honor, just to make clear, just
12
   in the last few minutes as I arrived to court, standby counsel
13
   both showed me addresses where the defendants are proposing to
14
   live, but, of course, having just received them, I have no
   ability to do any due diligence or look into the identity of
15
16
   that person, and also, I believe they provided the same address,
   which the Government would oppose consistent with our proposed
17
   condition that the defendants not have contact with each other
18
   outside the presence of standby counsel.
19
20
             THE COURT: Okay, thank you, Mr. Ligtenberg, and thank
   you for the update on that.
21
22
             And let me just also make sure I understand, the
23
   Pre-Trial Services reports, which were prepared in 2019 and 2021
24
   as I alluded to earlier, both contain the recommendations from
   the Pre-Trial Services Office that the defendants be detained
25
```

```
because, according to both reports, there is no condition or
   combination of conditions that Pre-Trial Services believed would
 2
   reasonably assure the appearance of the defendants here as
   required and the safety of the community.
 5
             Mr. Adams, is it correct that that is still the
   position of Pre-Trial Services as to both defendants?
 7
             OFFICER ADAMS: Yes, your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Adams. Okay.
 9
             Just wait to see if we can connect these folks through
   the conference line.
10
11
             (Brief pause)
12
             THE COURT: Okay, I think we have now successfully
13
   connected the teleconference line and we have, it sounds like,
   one or two individuals on the line who will be muted for the
14
   purposes of this proceeding, but they should be able to listen
15
   and hear at least relatively clearly, especially if we continue
16
17
   to speak into the microphones as I indicated earlier. Perfect.
             Okay, so that concludes my introductory remarks to
18
19
   sort of set the stage for where we are today.
20
             Mr. Ligtenberg, let me turn to you.
21
             Again, I have read the Government's submission and so
22
   there's no need to recite all of that in detail. I just want to
23
   turn to you to have you articulate whatever additional
24
   information you might like me to have as we start out this
25
   proceeding and particularly what the Government envisions in
```

terms of potential conditions for release.

MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor, and I don't have much to add that wasn't in our letter.

We do feel that the defendants are significant flight risks and pose a significant danger to the community given their minimal ties to the U.S., the connections overseas, and the nature of the offense which involved, as your Honor knows, taking these kids outside the U.S., so, you know, we certainly think those are the factors that led Pre-Trial to recommend detention.

We also recognize that the defendants have been incarcerated for a long time. We are trying to work with them to come up with conditions that we think would be appropriate in order to ensure that they do not flee and that they do not try to kidnap these kids and try to take them out again, but, as we've noted in our letter, I think the devil is in the details, so our conditions are laid out, I'm happy to list them, but -- I think, on page 8 of our letter.

And in addition to that, we would want sort of -especially given the history with respect to one of these
defendants of indicating to Judge Román that he would not follow
conditions, we would want to be satisfied that the defendants
will comply with conditions even if they disagree with it here
in court, and then we'd also want to conduct our due diligence
on the place they're living and who they're proposing to live

```
1
   with.
 2
                         Okay. And just because Mr. Malka and Mr.
             THE COURT:
  Malka may not have had the opportunity to read your letter,
   while they may be familiar with the conditions, especially
   Matityau Malka would be familiar with these conditions because
   you had proposed them in prior bail hearings with him, I want to
   make sure that Mordechay Malka is also familiar with the
   proposal, and I think just for clarity of the record, even
   though it is in the letter and I have read it, I think it does
10
   make sense, Mr. Ligtenberg, if you'd read each of the
   Government's proposed eight conditions so that we can have a
11
   discussion about those.
12
13
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
14
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you.
15
             MR. LIGTENBERG: So a $250,000 personal recognizance
   bond with five financially responsible co-signers; home
16
   confinement; the defendant cannot directly or indirectly
17
   associate or have any contact with known Government witnesses,
18
   victims, and victims' family members, although this would not
19
20
   limit investigators from conducting appropriate defense
21
   investigations conducted in the presence of standby counsel in a
22
   language that standby counsel can understand; access to one
23
   telephone without internet access and a pre-approved list of
24
  numbers to be called and consent to a pen register; access to a
25
   laptop computer with limited internet capability to be monitored
```

```
by Pre-Trial Services; consent to unscheduled inspection of
   phone and laptop; the defendant cannot directly or indirectly
   associate or have any contact outside the presence of standby
   counsel with his co-defendants and any contact in the presence
   of standby counsel must be in a language that standby counsel
   can understand; and finally, the defendant cannot directly or
   indirectly associate or have contact with any individual
   currently or formerly associated with Lev Tahor. However, the
   defendant can submit a list of names of people associated with
   Lev Tahor to the Government and Pre-Trial Services for approval
10
   for communications with those specific people.
12
             THE COURT: All right, just let me ask a couple of
13
   questions about this so I understand the scope of the
14
   Government's proposal.
15
             First, with respect to the home confinement proposal,
   would that be home confinement to be enforced with location
16
   monitoring?
17
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
18
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
             Also, just to follow up on the bond, earlier I
21
   referred to the bond as an unsecured bond. I assume that is
   what the Government's proposal is here?
22
23
             MR. LIGTENBERG:
                             Um...
24
             THE COURT: I mean secured -- there would be
25
   financially responsible co-signers, but there wouldn't be any
```

```
obligation for the defendant or their co-signers to put up any
   cash, collateral, or property or anything like that, correct?
 2
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I think we would be asking for a
 3
   secured bond.
 5
             THE COURT:
                        Okay.
                                In the amount of what?
 6
             MR. LIGTENBERG:
                             $250,000.
 7
             THE COURT:
                         The entirety of it secured?
 8
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay.
10
             And with respect to the conditions having to do with
   contacts with members of Lev Tahor, has that been a condition
11
12
   that has been accepted and implemented with respect to any other
   defendants?
13
             I know this is a multi-defendant case and different
14
   defendants are at different stages, I don't have the familiarity
15
   with the case that Judge Román does obviously, but I know that
16
   there have been different proceedings as indicated in some of
17
   the Government's submissions, so has this condition in
18
   particular been implemented with respect to any other defendants
19
20
   who are currently out on bond?
21
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor. One of the
   defendants' co-defendants about two months ago was released with
22
23
   the consent of the Government. It included this condition.
24
   defendant provided a list of individuals associated with Lev
25
   Tahor that he wanted to contact, and in that case, the
```

```
17
   Bail Hearing
                         USA v. Malka, et al.
   Government approved contact with every individual on that list.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay, and approximately how many people
   were on that list if you recall?
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I think approximately twenty?
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Okay.
 6
             And in that case -- and, again, every defendant is
   situated differently and has to be considered individually, so
   just because certain conditions were implemented for one
   defendant doesn't mean that those conditions are appropriate or
   sufficient for another day necessarily, but it does inform the
10
   Court's understanding of how these conditions can or could be
11
12
   implemented if I were to order those conditions, so that's why
13
   I'm asking these questions.
             With respect to the other defendant that you've
14
   referenced, Mr. Ligtenberg, would there -- were the conditions
15
   generally similar to the eight conditions listed here? Were
16
   there other conditions that were or were not included with
17
   respect to that defendant?
18
19
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I believe they were, they were
20
   roughly similar.
             THE COURT:
21
                        Okay.
22
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I don't remember the exact
23
   parameters, but I believe they were roughly similar.
```

THE COURT: That's fine. Okay, thank you, Mr.

Ligtenberg. Anything else that you'd like to add?

24

```
1
             MR. LIGTENBERG:
                              No, your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay.
 3
             So Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka, I understand that you are
   representing yourselves in this case pro se with the assistance
   of standby counsel. I will now turn to each of you to hear your
   position with respect to the proposed conditions of release.
 7
             What we have here is...not necessarily the typical
   scenario that we have in a hearing like this. Very often, the
   threshold issue in dispute is that the Government believes that
   the defendant should not be released at all. The Government
10
   very often takes the position that there is no combination of
11
12
   conditions that could reasonably assure the defendants'
13
   appearance or the safety of any person or the community.
14
   Government often takes a position that there are conditions, but
   it's often the case when we have a disputed hearing, like the
15
   one we have here, that the Government's position is there should
16
   not be release at all.
17
             That's not actually the Government's position today,
18
  but the Government has taken the position that in order for it
19
20
   to be comfortable with release and in order to consent to
21
   release, these conditions would be required, so we sort of can
22
   start our discussion a bit further along than where we might
23
   otherwise have to start the discussion, which would be at the
24
   threshold question of whether there is any condition or
25
   combination of conditions that would be appropriate.
```

```
1
             So I'm not sure who wants to begin. Have you
   discussed who should go first?
 2
             Mordechay Malka is indicating that he would like to go
 3
   first and so I'm happy to proceed that way, Mr. Malka, if you'd
   like to begin with sharing your thoughts. Again, ordinarily I
   would ask you to stand, but if it's easier for you to speak
   directly into the microphone while seated, that's actually fine
   also, especially so that we can make sure that we have a clear
   recording.
10
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
             THE COURT: So I'd just ask that you bring the
   microphone closer to you and we'll begin that way.
12
13
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Okay, thank you, Your Honor.
14
             I'm actually a little -- just for to start, I'm a
15
   little confused how to proceed here because, first of all, the
   Government submit their nine pages yesterday late night. Of
16
17
   course, no one of us was -- had the opportunity to even look
   into that or to know more. I mean, I hear, like, a few
18
   statements, what it says, my wife just told me on the phone some
19
20
   statements what it says there, but I can say that...I, I, I
21
   didn't, of course, had a chance to read it, to be able to
   respond to it, as I should, in a normal manner, but --
22
23
             THE COURT: Okay, well, let me just stop you there for
24
   one second.
25
             I do understand that. I will say that many of these
```

Bail Hearing

USA v. Malka, et al.

```
arguments are arguments that the Government has made in many
   prior proceedings in this case. As I alluded to earlier, I know
   this is your first bail hearing, Mr. Malka, so you may not have
   had this letter filed in proceedings that specifically
   implicated your bail application. However, I don't want to make
   an assumption.
 7
             Are the two of you brothers or you just have the same
   last name?
 9
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Cousins.
10
             THE COURT: Cousins, okay.
11
             So your cousin has seen almost all of these arguments
12
   before because they are almost identical to the arguments that
13
   were raised in his prior bail hearings, and so while I
   understand that that's not necessarily true for you, I don't
14
15
   think there's all that much in this submission that is new.
   understand that you've been working on this case in your own
16
   defense for a long time. A lot of the recitations in the
17
   Government's letter are taken actually almost verbatim from the
18
19
   indictment, which you're certainly familiar with.
20
             So I do understand that the submission came in late.
   I will say that that is also not uncommon in a bail hearing.
21
22
   Sometimes the submissions come in late. That happens. Your
   submissions came in on Friday night and it was 400 pages, so the
23
24
   Government didn't have a tremendous amount of time with that,
25
   although I think in your case also, many of those submissions
```

```
were things that the Government had seen already, so we're all
   trying to do the best we can, but I recognize that this did come
   in last night.
 4
             What I would suggest that you do is focus on the
   proposed conditions that the Government has considered, because
  if there is a way forward where you could see abiding by those
   conditions, then it -- despite the recommendation of Pre-Trial
   Services, I think I could find a way to release you subject to
   conditions.
             I haven't made any final determinations about whether
10
   those conditions are appropriate or not because I do want to
11
12
   hear your arguments about them as well, but there's a proposal
13
   on the table that provides a pathway to your release and so if
14
   there are aspects of that proposal that are not agreeable to
   you, I think we should focus your presentation now on the
15
16
   portions of that proposal that are not agreeable to you.
             Does that make sense?
17
18
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: So this exactly what I start to
   explain it.
21
22
             General, just to go over the conditions, I mean, most
23
   -- of course, the, the, the fact of bail conditions is not of --
24
   I'm not strange to that. I know this is common and I will agree
25
   and we always will -- we always said that we will do whatever
```

```
any judge, whatever, any order of any court. However, those are
   severe conditions. Those are conditions that is not usually
   always made. I can say there's some conditions here that I
   don't know if in history would happen such a condition. I will
   come to that.
 6
             But --
 7
                        Well, I'm not going to keep interrupting
             THE COURT:
   you because I do want to give you an opportunity to speak, but
   it's clearly not accurate to say that these conditions have
10
   never in history been implemented because Mr. Ligtenberg just
   said they were implemented with respect to one of your
11
12
   co-defendants a few weeks ago, so it -- now, if your point is
13
   that they've never in history been implemented prior to this
   case, I have no way of evaluating that or not. I will say that
14
   the vast majority of these conditions are not all that uncommon.
15
16
             There are a couple that are unusual, undoubtedly, but
17
   many of these conditions are imposed routinely in cases
   involving multiple defendants. In particular, the condition
18
   that one defendant cannot have contact, directly or indirectly,
19
20
   with his or her co-defendants outside the presence of counsel,
   that is a routine condition, as Ms. Wolfe or Mr. Vita could let
21
   you know, very, very common condition that rarely receives any
22
23
               That's not to say that you can't make an objection,
24
   but it's not at all unusual, certainly not unprecedented.
25
             The condition about contact with, with individuals
```

```
currently or formerly associated with Lev Tahor is more unusual,
   undoubtedly, but there are facts and circumstances in this case
 2
   that motivate that condition, so...
 4
             Anyway, please proceed.
 5
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Okay, so, your Honor, this is
   the exact point, pinpoint that I want to get.
 7
             Because the Government is asking such severe
   conditions that I believe it's very severe and, I mean...even
   without the, the restrictions about religious, the religious
10
   group, just home confinement is also not -- not everyone have
   home confinement with electronic monitoring. It's usually the
11
12
   -- on the most higher standard of conditions that this is in.
13
             Now, the reason to impose conditions is only assure
14
   that the person is not a flight risk or not dangerous. If those
   conditions that the Government is asking is forcing us to stay
15
16
   in jail, as it happens for two years already, because we cannot
17
   accept those such conditions, some of them because it violates
   our constitutional right as freedom of religion, some of them is
18
   directly jeopardizing our ability to defend ourselves. Then the
19
20
   results is that we stay in jail. So if this is the other side
21
   of the story, then that's why we came to the bail hearing with a
22
   totally different perspective.
23
             I want to prove and I want to show, as my right is, I
24
  believe, maybe not, the Court will tell me, that I'm not --
25
   there's no any concern of flight risk or dangerous, not to the
```

```
community, nor to any person.
                                  This is, this is -- I'm ready to
             Behind {sic} a reasonable doubt. I'm not saying
   prove it.
   preponderance of the evidence, I am going to go all the way.
  And that's why I ask the Court to allow me to call witnesses, to
   allow me to bring evidence as it said in 242 $ (f)(b)(2) (ph),
         That person be allowed to present witnesses, to
   cross-examining witness, to bring information and evidence, so
   that's why I want to do it because I know that that's the
   Government position.
10
             And at the end of the day, if we accept the
   Government's position, number one, we are dangerous, this is the
11
   number one, you already dangerous, you already flight risk, now
12
13
   let's move to the conditions, I feel that I didn't have my day
14
   in court, I didn't have my bail hearing, and just the simple
   language on the statute, in 342 (ph), says clearly that upon a
15
16
   person is being arrested, the Court should first of all
17
   determine if the person is a flight risk or is dangerous or is
   necessary to any conditions.
18
19
             I believe I can prove that I should be released, I
20
   should be released under B, under section B, under B, in
21
   recognition (inaudible) and whatever condition that I will not
22
   violate any, violate any federal, state law or whatever, any
23
   violation of the law. That's what I believe I am -- my category
24
       And I can prove it. I can prove that there's no any
25
   concern, there cannot be simply any concern.
```

And this is not -- this is very unusual. 1 very rarely find a case that the defendant can prove and will be 2 ready to prove at the bail stage that on the face, on the face of the charges, not going -- I'm not asking for a mini-trial, I know, I know Congress didn't want that bail hearings should be a mini-trial, I know that, I'm not asking for that, but I'm asking, simply, to be able to exercise my rights according to the Bail Reform Act to prove that I'm not dangerous and not a flight risk. If the Court wants, intends, to give us no choice but 10 to accept those conditions, then, of course, I have no choice 11 12 but go all over again from the beginning and let's make a whole 13 hearing, let me bring witnesses, let me prove me, let me 14 prove -- and then if I'm not winning here, I am going to appeal it and I am going to Second Circuit. I have no doubt that by 15 Second Circuit, after 33 months, after all the proven evidence 16 17 on the face of no dangerous, no flight risk, on the condition that restricting, restricting your religious association? 18 19 I mean, tell me when in history any judge or any 20 government prosecutor asks for a person, that you can be 21 released, but you cannot talk to your church, you can't talk to anyone, go find another church, go find another -- change your 22 23 What do you mean? This is my religion. 24 this -- I'm twenty years old -- twenty-eight years old. 25 Twenty-eight years I grew up in this religion. I know no other

```
Those are my rabbis, those are -- I mean, so that's
   religion.
   why I assume that the Government simply want to assimilate me,
   they want me to force me to change my religion. That's why
   Matityau Malka filed in docket 380, in the docket I cited to the
   Court, saying that he feels the Government wants to assimilate
         What is the reason for that condition?
 7
             I mean, Lev Tahor is a community of 350 men, women,
   and children. They're a peaceful community. They have nothing
   to do with crimes. Because the Government selected ten people
10
   or eight people and charged them with, with, with, with certain
   kind of offenses, that's why all men, women, children, they all
11
12
   criminals? And they all are -- so what is the logicalness of
13
   this condition beside of the dehumanize the community?
14
             THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Malka, I'm not going to get into
   a whole back-and-forth with you about what the Government is or
15
16
   isn't attempting to do. I just want to focus on a couple of
17
   factual inaccuracies in what you've just said.
             The condition that the Government has proposed with
18
   respect to contact with Lev Tahor does not forbid all contact
19
20
   with Lev Tahor. It is a condition that requires limitations,
   but it does not completely forbid all contact, so that's just
21
   not accurate.
22
23
             As to the question of whether you want to appeal
24
   whatever happens here today, that's your right to do and Judge
25
   Román can evaluate that at the appropriate time. What makes
```

sense to me from a practical standpoint, given that it is April 19th, 2022, and that you have a trial scheduled for May 18th, 2022, is to focus on the question of whether there are conditions that could allow for you to be released promptly, promptly, meaning before the trial, so that you could be released on bond, subject to conditions, as you prepare for the trial. An appellate process is going to take far longer than that to play itself out, so, you know, there is a practical consideration here based on the timing of everything given that 10 we're on the eve of the trial. 11 As far as the question of calling witnesses and you 12 proving that you're not a danger to the community or a flight 13 risk, I will give you some leeway to talk about that by way of a 14 proffer today, especially since it's your first bail hearing, but the Court has -- it's clear from case law that the Court has 15 16 discretion to limit the scope of what is and is not permissible 17 at a bail hearing in order to focus the inquiry on the questions that are most relevant for that bail hearing. 18 19 And you may say that what you're proposing to do is 20 not a mini-trial, but I have a different view of that. The idea 21 that you would call a whole slew of witnesses in an effort to 22 prove that you are not a risk of flight or a danger to the 23 community, that strikes me very much as what you will have an 24 opportunity to do at your trial next month, so we are not going 25 to have a parade of witnesses come in here for you to attempt to

prove somehow that you are not a risk of flight or a danger to the community, because the Government is not going to stand here and put up all of its witnesses to try to prove the contrary, nor is it required to. It is permitted under Second Circuit precedent to proceed at a bail hearing by way of proffer and you can do the same. 7 So I will give you a little bit of latitude to talk about that, we're not going to spend all day doing it, but I will give you some flexibility to talk about those arguments you 10 believe I should consider to evaluate whether you are or not -your release would or would not pose a risk of non-appearance or 11 12 danger to the community. I will come back to you in a moment. 13 I want to turn to your cousin Mr. Matityau Malka, because I believe in certain respects, you're a little bit 14 differently situated to Mordechay Malka only because you've been 15 here before, not with me, but with Judge Román and Judge 16 17 McCarthy, and have sort of gone through this exercise of making various arguments at bail hearings and seeing the Government's 18 19 position with respect to bail or detention and going forward. 20 One of the elements of the Government's submission that I did read, closely, was the transcript of your last 21 hearing with Judge Román where you through the assistance of an 22 23 interpreter read a letter that you had written to the Court and 24 then there was some colloquy about what that meant or didn't mean, and Judge Román ultimately determined that based on what 25

```
you had said at that proceeding, he felt that you had indicated
   an unwillingness to abide by the conditions of release that were
  being contemplated.
             There was some colloquy toward the end of that
 4
   proceeding where you seemed to be trying to suggest otherwise,
   and in advance of the proceeding today, Mr. Vita, in
   communicating with the Court, specifically with Ms. Brown, my
   courtroom deputy, about scheduling this proceeding, indicated
   that one change in circumstances with respect to you was that
10
   you had expressed to him and were prepared to express to the
   Court views that were not necessarily exactly the same as what
11
12
   you had expressed previously to Judge Román. That application
13
   or that communication was not in any way a violation of
   attorney/client privilege or anything of that nature because it
14
   was provided by Mr. Vita as an explanation for what
15
   circumstances had changed to justify an additional or new bail
16
17
   application on your behalf.
             And so I want to give you an opportunity, Mr. Malka,
18
   and, again, for the record, this is Matityau Malka, to share
19
20
   your thoughts on where we are from the perspective of your
   potential release today.
21
22
                                 Thank you very much, your Honor.
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA:
23
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, could you just put the
24
  microphone a little lower so you're speaking into it.
25
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Thank you very much, your Honor,
```

Bail Hearing

USA v. Malka, et al.

30

and...as the Court just mentioned now that by my previous bail hearing by Judge Román, it was some kind of a language that I will not or I'm not willingly ready now to obeying the orders that the Court will impose on me. This was, this was not so clear like that, because when I was just ask permission from Judge Román to read a three-page letter through the interpreter, before I just start to read this document, I mention to the Court very clearly that I have a lot of other notes that I was prepared to mention to the Court with that. 10 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Malka, we don't have to rehash the history of what happened back in October. Let's just 11 12 fast-forward to where we are today. 13 MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes. So as of today, I want to make sure that -- for the 14 Court that every condition that the Court will impose on my 15 behalf and this condition will not distract my freedom of 16 17 religion and not, and not to -- and this will not be like the 18 condition that I will not be allowed to talk to my, to my 19 community that I was growing up the last thirty years there, and 20 beside of that, I can say that almost seventy percents {sic} or 21 even more of this whole community is my close family, and now 22 that I am providing a list to the Government and by getting 23 permission from the Government to whom I'm allowed to talk or to 24 whom I'm not allowed to talk from my own religion, that I don't 25 have any other religion, I'm growing up in my previous thirty

Bail Hearing

USA v. Malka, et al.

years and my whole family is there, so now by getting permission from the Government, I'm allowed to talk to them and not to them and not to them, this is a peaceful community and all the allegations that the Government were -- just did about -against our community, that it's, it's...that it's a very dangerous community and all kind of allegations similar like that, it...everything is just based on newspapers or on other or...in -- because nothing was proved that our community is a dangerous community, that the only condition that even I already 10 sit way more than that time, I was been arrested on March 2019 and now already more than three years that I'm incarcerated in 11 12 the maximum of my -- in the maximum of the charge that I have, 13 it's three years, let alone the good time and all, and all other 14 things around that, but I already did almost over 37 months in jail and, and, and now, and, and, now, if I want to just -- to 15 16 be released, but just this condition, it's could not ensuring my 17 appearance to Court, is could not make any sense that it is right because my trial is in a month from now. 18 19 So if there -- if the Government just want ensure for 20 the Court that I will not flee from the country, to make sure 21 that I will show up in a day in court, I don't believe that there is any human being believe like that if somebody have a 22 23 court in a month from now and the maximum he could serve is 24 three years, so what is the reason to flee and leave the 25 country? If I already did my time, just to get another five

TABITHA R. DENTE, RPR, RMR, CRR (914) 390-4027

years or another year for contempt court and for other violations around that? It doesn't make even one percent sense that even I'm a flight risk, because I already did my time. 4 And I'm able and I want to obey every condition that the Court will impose on me, even there is a lot of conditions here that it's (inaudible) usually other defendants, and I am not saying that it's necessary, but I will agree to, agree to all of this...basically all of this conditions now I will obey it, but just this condition, not to talk to...so the only 10 condition, the issue is here, like, two, three conditions, but basically the conditions is around restrictions about the 11 12 contact with Lev Tahor, my own community. 13 And the same thing is with my, with my co-defendants 14 that especially that -- especially of this co-defendants that some of them are my rabbi, other are my teachers, and I don't 15 16 have any other, any other religion, even if I get to be 17 released, but just to study my religious needs, to study the bible, to study everything, so I don't have a problem to talk 18 just on the phone and everything will be monitored, everything 19 20 will be sent directly -- every phone call directly to my standby counsel and just to have limited computer with limited internet, 21 I don't have any problem with that, but even I don't see that 22 23 it's necessary, but focused on this condition with Lev Tahor. 24 The other condition is very important is that I cannot 25 understand whether this condition about I shall consent of

```
uninstructed {sic} search of my phone and laptop.
                                                       I understand
   for uninstructed inspecting search in the, in the house where I
   will be sitting, so this is I understand, but what is the reason
   about to have an uninspected {sic} search for phone and laptop?
             Especially I am proceeding pro se, so I have a lot, a
 5
   lot of privileged notes and correspondence with my standby
   counsel and a lot of draft notes that I just starting and
   witnesses statements that I'm looking through that and other
   stuff that I'm not ready to handle {sic} it over to the
10
   Government as of now, and it's not make any sense, even a
   little, that the Government would be able -- the same way the
11
12
   Government could not break in in another attorney's office and
13
   take privileged stuff from, from, from an attorney.
14
             I am not an attorney, but still I'm proceeding pro se,
   and all my notes is there and I have a lot of statements from
15
16
   different witnesses and also correspondence, private
17
   correspondence between me and Mr. Vita, and just this week, I
18
   cannot understand it make any sense of whether they have
19
   probable cause or if there is some -- unless they get a order
20
   from a judge so that is something, something is a little
   difference, but just uninstructed search is not making any sense
21
22
   for this.
23
             THE COURT:
                        Okay. I understand your point, Mr. Malka.
24
             Mr. Ligtenberg, why don't you address a couple of
25
   those points, one with respect to the unscheduled inspection of
```

the phone and laptop.

I mean, the point that Mr. Malka raises regarding

privilege is a valid point. I imagine that the Government would

have ways of potentially conducting those searches that would

guard against those valid concerns that Mr. Malka has raised, so

I'd like to hear your position on that.

And then with respect to the contact conditions, 7 and 8 in your letter, I'd like you to address the extent to which those conditions are contemplated for danger-to-the-community purposes as opposed to risk-of-flight purposes, because, again, I do think Mr. Malka raises a valid point with respect to risk of flight.

It's not to say that there's no risk of flight given, you know, various factors that have been laid out, including both Mr. Malkas's strong ties to, to foreign countries and comparatively more limited ties to the United States, but, you know, the Government often makes arguments with respect to flight risk based on the anticipated sentence being significant, and it seems here that the mirror image of that has to be considered and I think the Government has considered it to some extent, meaning that the potential sentencing exposure for these defendants after all this time is small, so Mr. Malka raises a reasonable point with respect to perhaps that counseling against a risk of flight or at least limiting the risk of flight in certain ways.

```
35
   Bail Hearing
                         USA v. Malka, et al.
 1
             So if you could address those two points, Mr.
 2
  Ligtenberg.
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor. Well, I'll start
 3
  with the last point, and I'd like to just correct for the record
   something that the defendant said. There is not a three-year
                      That is simply incorrect.
  maximum sentence.
 7
                         Okay, I understand -- and just be clear, I
             THE COURT:
   understood from prior filings and prior arguments in this case
   that the Government's position is that potential sentencing
10
   quidelines range, at least for Matityau Malka, would be 46 to 57
   months.
11
                              That's correct.
12
             MR. LIGTENBERG:
13
             THE COURT: That's something I read somewhere in one
14
   of the many submissions.
15
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Correct, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Of course, the parties can always dispute
16
   what the sentencing quidelines range is ultimately, but my
17
   understanding has been that that's the Government's position, 46
18
   to 57 months, based on what it knows now.
19
20
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Correct, your Honor, and for
   Matityau, the maximum would be eight years, for Mordechay, the
21
   maximum would be eleven years, and, yes, the Government believes
22
```

I would also note that some of those enhancements that

the guideline for both would be 46 to 57 months, well above the

amount of time that either of them have served.

23

24

```
36
```

```
are built into that calculation are enhancements that Judge
  Román already applied to their co-defendants in the prior trial,
   and some of them are victim-specific, not defendant-specific,
   for instance, the vulnerable victim enhancement, so I do think
   that that is the appropriate guidelines range.
 6
             THE COURT:
                        Okay, but, I mean, the defendants have
 7
   served upwards of 36 months in custody. Or served.
   they've been in custody for upwards of 36 months.
 9
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I believe that's true for Matityau.
   I think Mordechay, it's shorter, closer to 33 --
10
11
             THE COURT: Okay.
12
             MR. LIGTENBERG: -- but, yes, they've been
13
   incarcerated for a long time, and as your Honor noted, this is
14
   why we're trying to make an effort...to get them out.
15
             THE COURT: I understand, but to that point, I mean,
   if this were a case where you were coming in and saying that the
16
   potential sentencing exposure for a newly-arrested defendant
17
   were based on a quideline range, in Matityau Malka's case,
18
19
   between 10 and 20 months or -- if I have the math right, it's
20
   unlikely that you would be arguing, in fact, I'm sure you
21
   wouldn't be arquing, that there would be a risk of flight based
   on the sentencing. You might have other arguments for risk of
22
23
   flight, but you certainly wouldn't be arguing that based on the
24
   sentencing exposure.
25
             MR. LIGTENBERG: I think it's absolutely a factor your
```

```
Honor can consider, but I think there are so many other factors
   that show a risk of flight here, and there is an incentive the
   to flee. I do think there is a substantial likelihood that
   following a trial that they would be looking at additional jail
   time.
 6
             THE COURT: Look, I am not suggesting that there is --
 7
   that the sentencing issues are dispositive on this question one
   way or the other. It's just that I think you would acknowledge
   that in certain respects, those issues, theoretically at least,
10
   diminish the risk of flight. They don't entirely remove the
   risk of flight, but I think there is a degree to which it does
11
   diminish the risk of flight. You don't have to agree with that,
12
13
   that's what I think, but let's talk about the, the
   contact-limitation conditions, because Mr. Matityau Malka just
14
   addressed that more in the context of risk of flight.
15
             While I understand that that is a component of the
16
   Government's argument in the sense that communication with
17
18
   individuals who are abroad could potentially facilitate one's
   flight from the United States, I also understood that there was
19
20
   a component of that argument that also had to do with danger to
21
   the community, which was not addressed as part of Mr. Matityau
22
   Malka's presentation just now.
23
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Absolutely, your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: Okay, so if you'd address that on the
25 record, I'd appreciate it.
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

1 MR. LIGTENBERG: As your Honor saw in the indictment, as we laid out in our letter, this isn't just one attempt to 2 take these children outside the U.S. This is three separate attempts, including most recently about a year ago in March 2021 by another member of Lev Tahor who has not been arrested. are various members of Lev Tahor, including the defendants, who 7 have expressed their commitment to getting these kids back to Lev Tahor, to getting them out of the country. 9 These defendants acted at the command of the leaders, 10 Nachman Helbrans and Mayer Rosner. In various filings throughout this case, all of the defendants have made clear 11 12 their dedication to getting these kids away from their mother. 13 They think that, really, they haven't done anything wrong and 14 that they have every right to do it and they have worked at the direction of these leaders. Allowing them to have contact with 15 these leaders and with other leaders, unsupervised, without 16 17 standby counsel there, with certain leaders is -- absolutely poses a danger to the community, given the history of this case 18 of people -- lower-level people in Lev Tahor at the bidding of 19 20 more senior people trying to carry out these kidnappings, and 21 that's particularly the case given Lev Tahor's sizeable contacts 22 overseas, their demonstrated ability and the conduct here to get 23 out of the country, in many cases completely undetected, and 24 their efforts to move the community to places like Iran that are 25 likely outside the reach of U.S. law enforcement and would

and laptop.

25

successfully take the kids away from their mother forever potentially if there's no effort. So there are significant risks to allowing sort of 3 unfettered communication, but we realize they have close friends and family members and really, that their ties are to Lev Tahor and not to New York, and that's why we've tried to come up with a reasonable proposal, which, as we've explained, has worked with another defendant where, you know, if they want to talk to their mom, if they want to talk to siblings, close family 10 members, we're not going to stop them from doing that as long as it's reasonable, and as I said, the twenty-some people that were 11 12 listed by the other co-defendant, we approved every single one of them. 13 14 So we're not trying to cut them off from Lev Tahor, we're not trying to jam them up unnecessarily, I think we're 15 16 trying very hard to create a circumstance where they can get out under sufficient conditions, but, you know, we can't agree to 17 just let them talk to sort of anyone in that community who might 18 be prodding them to "just go grab the kids and get out of here," 19 20 as has happened multiple times in this case. It's a similar concern about co-defendants and, as your Honor noted, that is a 21 very standard condition in these circumstances. 22 23 THE COURT: All right, and then, Mr. Ligtenberg, on 24 the point about the request for unscheduled inspection of phone

```
1
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yeah, my understanding, and maybe
   Pre-Trial can step in here, is that, you know, this is a
 2
   condition that is imposed, it's imposed in child pornography
   cases I believe --
 5
             THE COURT: Mr. Ligtenberg, I've certainly seen it in
   child pornography cases.
 7
             MR. LIGTENBERG:
                             And --
 8
             THE COURT: Or something similar.
 9
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Certainly the Government isn't
10
   seeking to review any privileged documents or communications,
   but, you know, we'd be happy to work with Pre-Trial to set up
11
   some sort of mechanism, you know, to ensure that there are no
12
13
   privileges being broken, but ensure that he's also not using his
14
   phone and computer to try to plan another kidnapping of these
   children.
15
16
             THE COURT: No, I understand the purpose of it, Mr.
   Ligtenberg, and I guess, Mr. Adams, maybe you could speak to
17
   this briefly.
18
19
             I mean, to the extent that that condition were to be
   imposed, would it be that Pre-Trial would conduct those
20
21
   inspections?
22
             OFFICER ADAMS: If those conditions were given by the
23
   Court, we would be doing the inspection, and if we felt there
24
   was some violation, we would notify the Government of those
25
   violations so they could look into it to see if there were
```

```
41
```

```
actually violations.
 2
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
 3
             OFFICER ADAMS: So it would go from us to the
   Prosecution to determine whether if there were actual
   violations. We may think it's a violation, but they may not
   think it is.
 7
             THE COURT: Okay, that's helpful, Mr. Adams.
                                                            Thank
 8
   you.
 9
             And, Mr. Ligtenberg, would it be possible if that
   condition were to be implemented to have that evaluation --
10
   well...I'm not sure that it's necessary to have some sort of
11
12
   separate team involved in it because, again, as I understand it
13
   now and a little bit more clearly, the inspection would be
   conducted by Pre-Trial as opposed to by, for example, an agent
14
   of the FBI or whatever investigating agency has been taking the
15
   lead on this matter.
16
             I assume it's the FBI.
17
18
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Okay. Nor would it be an investigative
20
   agent from the U.S. Attorney's Office, it's Pre-Trial Services,
21
   which is an agency of the United States Government, yes, but
   not...not aligned with the United States Attorney's Office in
22
   the sense of being part of the prosecution team, so it is a
23
24
   distinction that is not incredibly clear for people who are not
25
   as familiar with the ins and outs of the criminal justice
```

42

system, I recognize that, but Pre-Trial Services is not working hand in glove with the United States Attorney's Office to try to achieve certain prosecutorial goals. Pre-Trial Services has a role to play in ensuring that whatever conditions are set by the Court are complied with during the course of a defendant's release pending trial. 7 Okay, thank you, Mr. Adams, and I'll come back to you in one second, Mr. Malka. 9 Mr. Ligtenberg, is there anything else that you wanted 10 to add on any of the questions I've presented so far? 11 MR. LIGTENBERG: No, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn back to Mr. Malka, 13 Matityau Malka. If you want to take a second to speak with Mr. 14 Vita, that's fine. 15 (Defendant consults Standby Counsel) 16 THE COURT: All right, I'd like to turn back to you, 17 Mr. Matityau Malka, if you'd like to address any of the points that you've just heard from Mr. Ligtenberg, which were designed 18 to speak to some of the issues that you just raised in your 19 presentation. 20 21 MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, your Honor. Thank you very 22 much. 23 The thing is about the uninspected search of the 24 computer and laptop, I would like to ask the Court if it's

possible to do such a condition like this as would be that if

the Pre-Trial Services, it's possible to, to seek a search warrant from the Court in based on probable -- based on their concern why they want to do it. This is one thing. And if this is not, if this is not a, if this is not a -- if this could not be done at least before the handling {sic} over the stuff what they believe it's a violation of condition or something like this, they should, they should be -- before they send it to the Government, they should just send it to the Court for a in-camera review, and then if the Court...this is regarding the 10 computer and...this is regarding the computer and the laptop. 11 But now I want to make a, now I want to make -- now I just want to mention to the Court that my last two, three 12 13 previous bail hearings, the Government was requesting a 14 non-secured bond of \$230,000, and now the Government change it for a secure bond. Even it's hard for me, like I explained 15 before, but I will obey it, and not just I will obey it, I have 16 17 it already ready, I have already a place to live, I have between five or ten co-signers, how much the Court will impose on me, I 18 have it ready already, and this is people that are financial and 19 20 it's people that where they have businesses in, in their financial. 21 22 And, and I just want to, I just want to, I just want 23 to point out to the Court if there is any other condition in the 24 whole history that it's could changed the condition of number 7 25 and 8 regarding the condition about not -- to be limited to talk

USA v. Malka, et al.

44

to my community and to my defendants, so I will be able to agree every other condition that the Court will impose on me, even it's very, very hard and it's not usual, but I will take this instead of this, just because I understand the Government just mention now that they are not limiting me because I will be able to talk to my family, my siblings, but the issue here is not just about talking to my family, my siblings, the issue is, like I mentioned to the Court before, that this is my, this is my religion and my religion is not just to talk to my father and my 10 mother, my wife, my children, my other siblings, the issue is this is my community, and just -- not just because the 11 12 Government decided to pick up from 350, something like this, 13 men, woman, children, to charge them, it's mean already that the whole community they are criminals and they are allow now to 14 single out this community just because that. 15 And also, the Government mentioned earlier what is --16 that I was get involved to kidnap those victims, those children 17 from New York, from the mothers, and there is two things. 18 19 First of all, I am not charged with them, I'm charged 20 with attempt, and especially with this, especially it's -- the 21 only -- the only, the only thing what, what I was -- with what I was have involved to do with this case is just the handling over 22 23 few phones to the minor and that's it and everything was based 24 on the request of the minor themself, and there is not even one 25 phone conversation on those phones that was handled over to the

```
minor, not an incoming call, not a outcoming call, nothing from
   those phones that I provide for minor one.
             And it is not in the Government -- and the Government
 3
   cannot say that I was getting involved with, with, with even,
   even -- I'm saying very clearly on the record that it didn't was
   -- that it didn't was here a violation about the Court only
   because even when the Family Court, when the Family Court was
   issue a temporary order --
 9
             (Brief interruption)
10
             THE COURT: Hold on one second. If you can mute that
11
          I'm not sure what happened.
12
             (Brief pause)
             (Off-the-record discussion)
13
14
             THE COURT: All right, Mr. Malka, you can continue.
15
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Thank you.
16
             So the thing is just I was -- there's no any record
17
   how I was involved in any kind of, of kidnapping someone out of
   the country, take out of the hand of the mother, even in the
18
   time when the Government was arrest me, so the file was not
19
20
   served with the papers that the mother had the custody and took
21
   it out from the father, the father was just served the papers
   until January 3, so in the time when I was arrested March 26th,
22
23
   the father was not served and not aware that the mother still
24
  have the custody from -- of the children, but even this is --
25
   even it's could be that a family issue, a Family Court issue,
```

but they're saying that -- the Government saying that I was

46

violate a Family Court order by doing it, but it's just -- I was just handle over a phone and there was no any kind of attempt and it was in front of the mother's house in the middle of the day, so if I was -- really was want to kidnap, like the Government has covered, the minors, so who would go in the middle of the day in front of the mother's house and handle over a phone for a minor? 9 So there's even not one percent sense to believe that 10 if somebody approach with -- in, in the middle of the day, in front of the mother's house, when they can just in one second 11 12 call -- contact the police and let them know, so which kind of 13 attempt for kidnapping is it if it's just the middle of the day? 14 It is not just in some...some plans for -- or I didn't talk nothing about any plan, just handle over a phone. 15 16 And the only reason I'm handling over the phone for 17 her was just she was restricted and not allowed to report the 18 abuse what Abraham Greenwald with another quy, that his name is Abraham Itzhak Mertz, and another guy with the name is Joseph 19 20 Litchkin, but we have so many records how those guys especially, especially Abraham Greenwald, was abused this night. 21 22 And also we have phone conversations, recorded with 23 consent from the minor, how few days before my arrest and few 24 days after my arrest, she was trying to report the abuse when 25 she went over from all those people, and nobody was allow her to

```
report the abuse because they didn't want it the abuse that they
   did to be reported.
             And it's not just that. Two weeks, two weeks before
 3
  my arrest, I was at an interview with Detective Booth in...in
   Williamsburg, in Brooklyn, and I told him all the abuse was this
  minor going through, and he open up the computer from the
   station and he saw several of, of phone, of phone calls calling
   from the minor in trying to reporting the abuse. And I told him
   exactly -- and I ask them, I ask Detective Booth, is this a
10
   violation or I'm doing something wrong by providing her a phone
   just to be able to report abuse? He told me no. If the mother
11
12
   -- if, if, if...there is not -- it is not any kind of overt act
13
   of some kind of kidnapping or just to handle over a phone to be
14
   able to report abuse, there's not such any crime and this is the
   only thing.
15
16
             And also, I went willingly with him to report the
   abuse and he saw on the record so many abuses what she was --
17
   went through.
18
19
             THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Malka, I'm going to stop you
   there.
20
21
             I do understand that you have what you believe to be a
  meritorious defense to this case. I understand that.
22
23
   Government obviously has a very different view of the
24
   significance of all of this. That's why the prosecution has
25
   continued, other co-defendants of yours were convicted already.
```

```
That doesn't mean that you are necessarily going to be
   convicted, you have the presumption of innocence, but there's a
   lot to this case. When I said that we were not going to have an
   extended colloquy about all of this today, that is partly what I
   meant, but I appreciate everything you've shared so far.
 6
             Let me ask you, before I turn back to your cousin, I
 7
   do understand that there are particular conditions that the
   Government has proposed that are objectionable to you and I will
   make a final determination on those when we wrap up this
10
   proceeding, but this is a critical question and it was where you
   were tripped up, clearly, in the last proceeding before Judge
11
12
   Román, and the question is this.
13
             If I were to impose all of the conditions, including
   the unscheduled inspection and the limited contact with your
14
   co-defendants and the limited contact with members of Lev Tahor,
15
   if I were to agree with the Government that those conditions
16
17
   were appropriate and reasonably necessary to ensure your
   appearance and the safety of any person and the community, would
18
   you abide by those conditions? Meaning would you follow those
19
20
   conditions if I were to impose them.
21
             (Brief pause)
22
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: I just want to ask the Court the
23
   permission to...
24
             THE COURT: Yes, speak to Mr. Vita.
25
             I mean, the record should reflect that there was a
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

49

long pause, several seconds, maybe ten seconds, in response to that question and Mr. Malka has asked to speak to his standby counsel, which he certainly should do. 4 (Defendant consults Standby Counsel) 5 MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, your Honor, every condition, even that is not set up here in this proposal, even though be very critical and very hard for me, I will obey it and I will obey every other and each order that the Court will impose on 9 me. 10 But just what I want, what I want to make clear, that even about, even about the uninspect -- the uninspect {sic} 11 12 search of the computer and laptop, if I don't have any choice, 13 for sure, I will obey it, if there is no any other choice to do 14 it in a different way, but the only thing is what I want to make, please, ask very much the Court, that I already, I already 15 16 am in jail here over three years and my wife and my children, 17 they're ready to come here and to be able to -- in the apartment where I shall be released. I just want to ask the Court if 18 19 there is any other condition in the whole history, even it's 20 could be \$500,000 personal reconization {sic} with secured bond 21 or more stricter than that, more co-signers, fine. I'll put on some properties or other -- any other condition. Even as it be 22 23 very hard, I will hundred percent obey it and fully, but just 24 ask very much the Court that because I want to have the 25 opportunity to prepare how much it's possible in the last few

```
days before trial that the Court shall release me on -- under
   all -- the Court shall try to find every other condition, more
   co-signers, more money, or any which other condition, but not a
   condition that it will violate my constitutional right, that
   this is violate that I don't have -- that I could not talk to my
   community and just within the (inaudible) and just permission
   especially that I mentioned, that I don't have a problem to talk
   with just one phone, a recorded phone, directly to the, directly
   to my standby counsel or directly even to the Pre-Trial
10
   Services, but -- and everything should be recorded.
11
             So if there is any issue that I could get in touched
12
   {sic} with somebody to do any crime that I'm not -- I will not
13
   do it, but even though some kind of concern about that,
14
   everything is recorded, a second after the phone conversation,
   everything is sent to Pre-Trial or to standby counsel, but --
15
16
   so, so... I really asking the Court to -- please, to find any
   other condition to avoid this condition and I will obey
17
   everything in full what the Court will impose on me.
18
19
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Malka. Just give me
20
   one second.
21
             Ms. Brown...
22
             (Off-the-record discussion)
23
             (Brief recess)
24
             THE COURT: I'd like to turn now to Mr. Mordechay
25 Malka and give you an opportunity to address some of the points
```

```
you referenced earlier with respect to risk of flight and danger
   to the community on your own behalf.
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
 4
             As I said just earlier, I feel that in order for me --
   I mean, after, like, all of the nine pages that the Government
   produced, after all the negativity and allegations in the
   indictment that the Court told me, the Court had the opportunity
   to review it, after all -- after what they just mentioned here
   on record, maybe it's not ordinary, maybe not all cases is
10
   asking to have those kind of bail hearings, but I believe in my
   case, after -- to disprove what the Government says, I mean,
11
12
   they mention nine pages, I mean, many of -- many...things that I
   know the Court will take this in consideration to decide if we
13
14
   are flight risk or dangerous to the community, so to disprove
   what they said and to prove what I want to prove, what is the
15
   truth, what, what is the facts according to the all factors to
16
   be considered in sub-section G, limited, I understand -- again,
17
   I'm not trying to make it a mini-trial, but if the, if the
18
19
   statute mention this, not I, I mean the statute mention it, a
20
   defendant should have an opportunity to provide witnesses and
   evidence and cross-examining witnesses.
21
22
             So that's...unless the Court tell me different I don't
23
   think so, I will say as I know. I'm not a lawyer, I'm not -- I
24
   never really practice law --
25
             THE COURT: Right, but you've chosen to represent
```

```
52
```

```
yourself in this case, so --
 2
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: -- so the I'm-not-a-lawyer explanation is
   really not adequate. It's your choice to be here representing
   yourself, so it is a choice you have to live with.
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: No, but what I say is -- what I
 6
 7
   want to say is, I can say what statute say, but if the actual
   law is different and there is no such right to bring -- to
   provide witnesses and evidence at a hearing, then the Court can
10
   tell me and I will accept it whatever the Court say because the
   Court know the law, I don't -- the Court do know. I may have --
11
             THE COURT: What I have said is there is a certain
12
13
   amount of discretion that courts have with respect to what
   evidence can and can't be presented at a bail hearing, and I
14
   have not heard you explain to me any reason why witnesses are
15
   necessary to address the issues in this case for purposes of a
16
17
   bail hearing. At trial, you'll have an opportunity to confront
   and cross-examine the witnesses against you. For purposes of
18
   the bail hearing, particularly when there is a proposed package
19
20
   for release and particularly given the timing and logistical
21
   circumstances here, I am asking you to explain to me what you
   expect those witnesses would say that would include the Court's
22
23
   evaluation of the factors involved for a bail determination, so
24
   just tell me what you think the witnesses would say.
25
             I gather from what Matityau Malka has said, one of the
```

```
witnesses you propose to call here is the victim in this case --
   one of the victims in this case. I have never once heard of a
   scenario where a defendant at a bail hearing calls the alleged
   victim in a case as part of the bail hearing. I -- that might
   very well be unprecedented and I -- that seems problematic on so
  many levels that I can't even begin to list all of them.
 7
             You seem to think that the victim in this case will
   somehow vindicate your defense and demonstrate that you are
   not...a danger to the community or a risk of flight. It's not
10
   really -- I'm not sure what your basis for that conclusion is,
   but that is what you anticipate you might elicit from the victim
12
   in this case if you were able to call one or both of them to
13
   testify.
14
             That is one of the points you want to raise, correct?
   Yes? You're nodding your head.
15
16
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yes, your Honor.
17
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
             You also indicated in your submission that you wanted
18
19
   to call certain individuals from the jail? I'm not sure if
20
   those were meant to be other defendants or jail employees, to
21
   testify on your behalf about how you have been compliant with
22
   conditions at the jail. Is that correct?
23
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yeah, it was a co-conspirator --
24
             THE COURT: Co-conspirator.
25
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: And the chaplain, the Jewish
```

```
chaplain, at the jail. Yeah, both.
                                        A rabbi.
 2
             THE COURT: Okay. It's not clear to me how good
   conduct at the jail has any basis one way or the other on the
 3
   questions that are relevant for the Court's determination at a
   bail hearing whether you would be a danger to the community or
  risk of flight. Certainly if you're in jail, you're not a risk
   of flight. That's the definition of jail.
 8
             And the danger-to-the-community prong, because you --
   even if you were completely compliant with all jail rules and
10
   regulations, I'm glad to hear that, that is certainly a good
   thing, but it doesn't necessarily shed much light on whether you
11
12
   would or would not be a risk of flight or a danger to the
13
   community if you were released, so I don't think there's any
14
  need to have witnesses testify as to those points.
15
             It wasn't entirely clear what the third category of
   witness that you were seeking to call was because it was -- the
16
  name was redacted from the submission.
17
             What was the third category?
18
19
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: It was another co-conspire --
20
   alleged co-conspirator, yeah.
21
             THE COURT: Okay. So you propose to call witnesses
   who were alleged co-conspirators in the case to offer testimony
22
23
   on your behalf as to why you if you were released would not be a
24
  risk of flight or a danger to the community. That is on its
   face not especially persuasive.
25
```

```
Now, that may ultimately be useful testimony for you
 1
   at trial, for the defense that you are seeking to put forward,
 2
   and I won't be there at the trial, you can proceed in whatever
   way Judge Román authorizes and that is consistent with the
   Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but I don't see the need for
   testimony from any of those witnesses to address the specific
   inquiries that are before me at today's hearing.
 8
             If you'd like to tell me in your own words a bit more,
   as Mr. Matityau Malka did a few minutes ago, about why you
10
   believe that you are not a danger to the community or would not
   be a danger to the community if released or pose any risk of
11
12
   flight, you should go ahead and do that, but I don't -- nothing
13
   that has been said here today convinces me that there is a need
   to present witnesses for purposes of my evaluation at this bail
14
15
   hearing.
16
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
17
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
18
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: So I will do what you propose me
19
   to do, to go on and try to lay out -- at least start to lay out
20
   my arguments and hopefully that in some way to be enough for the
21
   Court to, to convince the Court that I'm not dangerous.
   However, I want to pinpoint one point the Court just said, and
22
23
   this is a very -- I'm very glad the Court said this.
24
             The Court said that the Court had never -- the Court
25
  never had such a case like -- that someone calling the victim to
```

testify on his bail hearing so he should be released, so this is true, this is true, I know. This is -- and most cases, I mean, 99.99 percent of the cases, the victims will testify the opposite, they will say that person hurt me or tried, whatever, to -- that -- to, to, to kill me or whatever, robber {sic} me or whatever, he should stay in jail, he is dangerous to me, but this factor that the Court just said indicate to me that the Court had never had the chance to hear anything clearly from our side, and this is clear. The Court is right. 10 After reading the Government's nine-page position, after hearing the Government's on, on, on...whatever --11 12 THE COURT: Just to be clear, as I said at the 13 beginning, you submitted 400 pages of materials. I read a lot of them, not all of them, but it's not accurate that I haven't 14 seen any of what you've provided on, on what you describe as 15 your side of the case. That's just not accurate. 16 You can continue. 17 18 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yeah, your Honor, by the way, I 19 hope the Court realize that whatever was submitted was not the 20 main point of my motion. For some reason, my lawyer wasn't able 21 to upload, some of them was with redacted information, and 22 therefore I will say maybe my most important material did not 23 went on, on the docket, so -- but anyway, this factor that the

victim -- that why we say, why I want to call the victim and --

it, it, it stands alone to show and to support our argument that

24

```
there's no dangerous at all to the very same victim.
 2
             There was never -- yes, when the Government say
   thirty-five times kidnapping, kidnapping, kidnapping,
   kidnapping, kidnapping, again and again, twenty
   times victim, victim, victim, victims, everyone thinks
   that this is, whatever, this is a kidnapping, this is a victim,
   right? But when the Court will hear my test -- my arguments, my
   evidence, my witnesses, the Court will find out totally
   different picture, 180-degree different. The Court will find
10
   out that there was no kidnapping at all, there was no victim at
   all, there was no any concern about the well-being of the
11
12
   children or any, any, any factor that might be found by anyone
13
   that there was such victim here, totally the opposite. The
   Court will find, with my evidence, that the defendants only
14
   acted in effort to help this...children. The children cry for
15
16
   help; we tried to help them. We tried to provide humanitarian
17
   help for a child.
             Your Honor, I know you never had such a case, but this
18
   is not an ordinary case. That's why I'm saying, your Honor,
19
20
   that's what -- we never had a chance. The defendants during the
   three years of this proceeding have never had a chance, once, to
21
   present their side of the case.
22
23
             Yes, there was a trial. I'm not going to go into that
24
  because the Court is not -- it's a different judge, I'm not
25
   going to go into that, but, in fact, if the Court will check the
```

```
record, you'll see the defendant was removed -- their pro se
   right was removed right, right before the trial on the day when
   the trial begin, so their lawyers didn't present their side at
   all and -- but anyway, this will go up to appeal.
             Now, when the Court and unfortunately the Government
 5
  is, is putting us in a position where we cannot present, if we
   cannot prove what we want to prove, right? There will always
   will be victim, you will always will be -- you will always say
   dangerous because you cannot prove different, but if the Court
10
   will allow me to prove it, I will prove it. And your Honor,
   this is not my evidence I gonna, I gonna pull up from whatever.
11
12
   This obvious evidence on the -- from the Government's own
13
   discovery, your Honor. There is many recordings from, from the
14
   very same victim, so-called victim, where she's pledding {sic}
   for help. Your Honor, you have to be...any reasonable person
15
16
   who see those evidence will understand, that this case can never
17
   be dangerous, you can never be dangerous to the very same
   victim.
18
19
             Let me give you just one example, a simple example.
20
             Someone, whatever, a, a, a -- someone's get caught for
   shoplifting, some kind of burglary, and he's calling his
21
22
   friend -- he's in the police car, he's calling his friend and
23
   saying, oh, I am here, I got caught, can you help me. He say,
24
   oh, what can I help you. I don't know, come here. So he came.
25
  He tell the police, look, just open me the door so I can go
```

```
He opens the door of the car and he runs away with him.
   Tomorrow, this person get charged. At the hearing, the
   Government says that he's dangerous to the community. Why is he
   dangerous? To whom is he dangerous? He dangerous to the person
   that he helped, to him he's dangerous, and he's a victim of who?
   He's a victim of him, of the rescued person.
 7
             I mean, this might be illegal, it might be a criminal
   contact, but you can never say this is a victim, you can never
   say he dangerous to the very same victim. You can say he's
10
   dangerous to other people because, whatever, maybe he can help
   other criminals to escape, but it's maliciously -- the
11
12
   fundamental is malicious to say that this is -- that he's a
13
   victim of him and he is simply whatever -- or try to call that
   he just kidnapped him, he kidnapped this person and whatever.
14
15
             I mean, this is totally different story, your Honor.
16
   This is not -- there's no even -- it's not even -- it's not a
   close call. It's not at all. There's no -- all the evidence
17
   will show the difference, show you that there's no victim, no --
18
19
   and that's why, of course, definitely is the -- your Honor, the
20
   mother of the minors also so-called victim because when a
21
   parental kidnapping, the victim should be -- my lawyer help me
   to write at least a motion to the Court where she argue that in
22
23
   this case, the victim should be the mom, not the children,
24
   because it's parental kidnapping, but anyway...
25
             So the mom of the children, the mother, the one that
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

work for the Government and came testify for the Government at the last trial, she wrote a letter to the Court last month for the sentencing and she said the incarceration of the defendants is damaging and is causing pain to -- and suffering to me and my children. My incarceration is the biggest tragedy for the victim. When the victim will stand here, she will cry to the Court "let them out, they helped me, they didn't kidnap me, I'm not dangerous to them, they not dangerous to me, why are they in jail, I don't understand, " from first day. 10 Your Honor, there's a video, that I ask to play videos, I will give you one example, there's a video interview 11 12 that the Government interviewed the victim. It was January 9th, 13 2019. Just right after they brought back the alleged victims 14 from Mexico, and I will go into that, how the victims try to fight with them not to come back here. They knew that they 15 16 gonna be abused here, they knew that they were rescued, but the Government force them back and assure the continue abuse here. 17 Because they gotta win the case. Or because they gotta 18 destroy the Lev Tahor community, but we'll get to that later. 19 20 So in this individual, this is the first -- the first that we got it, probably there were other interviews, we did not 21 get most of the discovery that they should got -- they should 22 23 give us, we didn't got it, as many violation that they're doing 24 in this case. It's also, by the way, a factor of the length of 25 the detention. We'll get to that later.

USA v. Malka, et al.

61

In this video, the minor, the, the, the FBI agent is 1 questioning her what happened, what is going on, why did you 2 went to Mexico, why are they arrested. They're asking her. So he responding, oh, because they help me. So they say, what, did they help you? He say, yes, I asked them to help me, to help me, that's why. And then what he say? Can I please go visit them in jail, I want to talk to them, I want to talk to them, they are my people, I want to go -- I want to talk with them, why can I not talk with him. Your Honor, have you ever find a 10 victim to say this? Never. Not -- this is totally, totally different case. It's not the only -- it's not the usual case. 11 12 This is a case of pure religious persecution. 13 no any logic in this case, and the Government knows that. This 14 defendant is from whom? From them. Not from me, your Honor, from the Government, and there's hundreds of hundreds of pieces 15 16 of evidence like this available in discovery. The Government 17 knows it, and there's many more that the Government doesn't 18 know. 19 There's a recording where the girl talked to a friend 20 two days after Matityau was arrested, two days, and she's 21 telling the friend -- and the Government has it, this is Goldie Rosner, the friend, the Government know what I'm talking. 22 23 they want to know. So this -- so the minor saying to her friend 24 "do you know what I went through here, you can't imagine what I 25 went through here. I went through fifteen times hell." Where?

TABITHA R. DENTE, RPR, RMR, CRR
(914) 390-4027

```
Where did she went through? By us? No, by the Government.
                                                                Not
  by the defendants, by the Government. In other words, she's a
   victim, but from the Government, not from us. Totally different
   story. There's so many proven evidence.
             It's course, of course, the minor will testify in our
 5
   favor, no doubt about it. In the trial, in the trial, the minor
   testified and said that she asked us to help her and she didn't
   want to be here and she was blocked here by force. Your Honor,
   the Government say kidnapping, kidnapping? When there's no any
10
   sense of kidnapping, any sense of kidnapping, anything.
   no any, any reason why they should call kidnapping. Helping a
11
12
   child to run away from abuse is kidnapping?
13
             I mean -- and the Government's saying that when they
14
   know, they know, that the children are not from here, the
15
   children lived in Guatemala for many years. Just a few weeks
   before the alleged kidnappings, the Government, the U.S.
16
   Government -- I don't say the Prosecution Office because it
17
   wasn't involved them, but the Government wrote in their
18
19
   submissions, they say that the mom grab the children, so the mom
20
   kidnap those children from Guatemala by force, by force.
21
   minor testified in trial that she was blocked here by force
   against her will. Not the five-year-old child, a
22
23
   fourteen-year-old young woman. Poor woman, she was brought here
24
  by force. And abused and tortured here. Everything why, why?
25
   Because you gotta change your religion. You Lev Tahor? You
```

```
gotta be assimilated.
                          Okay, you gotta change your religion and
   find another religion here? You don't want, you will be force.
  We will force you, we will make sure you change your religion.
 4
             So she was -- they kidnapped the children, they
   brought them here by force, the children cried to us for help.
   I was not able to sleep at night when I heard the abuse of the
              I have a recording here also provided by the
   Government recently where I am -- it was, like, two, three weeks
   before the alleged kidnapping. I am talking to one of the
10
   witnesses I want to call, Aron Rosner, this was the last one the
   Court asked me, and I talking to him on the phone and I telling
11
12
   him what I hear from another co-conspirator, alleged --
13
   everyone's a co-conspirator now, alleged co-conspirator, and I'm
14
   telling him -- I didn't know he were recording me and I'm trying
   to tell him, to tell him what the children went through, the
15
   abuse the children went through just the last few days, and I'm
16
17
   telling him that this co-conspirator that told me, that told me
   that -- later on became an informant for the Government, so he
18
19
   told me, "I won't be able to sleep tonight when I just heard
20
   what the children went through."
21
             Your Honor, there's so many -- there's not any piece
   of evidence to support a dangerous of flight risk, any piece of
22
23
   evidence. What is the case about? There's no case at all.
24
             Let's say, your Honor, there is such a law that even
25
   if you help a child escape abuse, even if you help a child for
```

```
humanitarian aid, the law is above everything, and whatever it
   was, it was a custody order, you not allowed to do it, leave her
   to die, don't help her. Let's say there's a case, let's say I'm
   a criminal, I'm the biggest criminal, but dangerous? Where's
   dangerous, your Honor? Flight risk? Where's the flight risk?
             Your Honor, do you know that at the time of my arrest,
 6
 7
   I was in Guatemala with my wife and children at home.
                                                          I was, I
   was...confident at home, I didn't -- wasn't fear of any -- of
   the Government. I was in Guatemala far away. When I hear that
10
   I'm indicted, right away I took a plane, I game to Guatemala.
   left my children behind, left my wife, left my family. With
11
12
   tears in my eyes, I get on a plane and came here. Because I
13
   want to be honest. If I am charged, I gonna face it.
                                                          I wanna
  be here in trial. It doesn't matter. And I'm incarcerated
14
   since then. And if the Court think that I'm, I'm feeling bad
15
16
   about what I did? No, no, I did the right thing. So I came
17
   back, turn myself in for two-and-a-half years. All why?
   face trial. To be able to prove my innocence. And I'm a flight
18
   risk? I am a flight risk? I came here myself. What the
19
20
   Government's talking about, where the flight risk, what they
   talking about, what the heck they talking about?
21
22
             And, your Honor, even more, for the last two years
23
   already, the Government is -- it's not a new thing the
24
   Government said today that they, whatever, the conditions --
25
   they don't post bail, we just need to accept certain conditions.
```

```
Your Honor, for two years they saying this already.
 2
             Two years ago in March 20 was a bail hearing of my
   co-defendant. At the bail hearing, the Court told him, you can
 3
   be released now, right now -- it was Judge Davison -- you can be
   released right now, just accept the conditions, the very same
   condition the Government just said now. He said, "I can accept
 7
   everything, but not talk with my community? I'd rather go back
   to jail." He went back to jail for two years, two more years.
 9
             Can you find another honest person like him? A person
10
   that when he will tell the Court "I'm going to follow the
   condition, I'm not gonna run, I'm gonna appear in court, I'm not
11
12
   gonna do any crime, I'm not gonna kidnap any children," I would
13
   put a million dollars on his word. A person -- this is who we
14
   are. And myself, the Government already at least seven, eight
   months saying you can go out, just accept these conditions.
15
   tell you no, those conditions violating my constitutional
16
17
   rights, I'm not gonna lose from my community. You want to
   dehumanize a Jewish religious community? For why? For what?
18
   What I did wrong? You want to make sure to impose on me such
19
20
   condition I cannot defend myself? No. So I'd rather stay in
21
   jail.
22
             Your Honor, did you find --
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, let me interrupt you because
23
24
   that is a critical point that you've just made.
25
             Because if I am not persuaded that... I understand that
```

```
you have arguments that you've been discussing for the past
   fifteen minutes or so that are -- go to the heart of this case,
   go to the merits of this case. As I said earlier, you will have
   your opportunity, consistent with the Federal Rules of Criminal
   Procedure and Judge Román's rulings, to present those arguments
   at your trial, but you're getting to kind of the nub of the
   issue just there in your last statement, because if I am not
   persuaded by your argument that you pose no risk of flight and
   no danger to the community, then the question would be, if I
10
   were also then persuaded that in order to ensure your appearance
   as required and the safety of any person or the community that I
11
12
   needed to impose the conditions recommended by the Government, I
13
   have the same questions for you as I had for Mr. Matityau Malka,
   who did answer that question ultimately quite directly, and that
14
   is, if I were to impose those conditions, would you comply with
15
   those conditions.
16
17
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Your Honor, I would comply with
   even much harder conditions. Even if the Court tell me you
18
19
   don't talk to anyone in the world, anyone --
20
             THE COURT: I'm sorry, say that again, please.
21
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: If the Court will tell me I
   cannot -- I'm not allowed to talk to anyone in the world, in the
22
23
   entire world, I will follow it. I will follow it. Maybe I'm
24
   dangerous. Maybe I'm that dangerous. I'll believe you, I will
25
   leave -- I will trust you and follow you. But telling me the
```

conditions that the Government say? Dehumanizing my community,

```
violating my freedom and saying a pre-approved list, your Honor,
   those are things that I'm not allowed to -- I'm not allowed --
   your Honor, this is not --
 5
             THE COURT: Listen, ultimately these are the
   Government's proposed conditions. If the conditions are
   imposed, it will be me, it will be the Court, that will be
   imposing the conditions, okay? So that answer that you just
   gave was...I don't understand it.
10
             I don't understand -- when you say you would accept a
   condition that you would not talk to anyone in the world, but
11
12
   you wouldn't accept the condition as proposed by the Government,
13
   I don't understand that, those two things are inconsistent with
14
   one another, so I need a clearer answer, that if I, the Court,
   were to impose the conditions that are recommended by the
15
16
   Government, if I were to impose those conditions, would you
17
   comply with those conditions.
             It's really a yes-or-no question, and if the answer is
18
   no, it's important that I understand that.
19
20
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Your Honor --
21
             THE COURT: And if you'd like to discuss that with Ms.
   Wolfe for a second, that's perfectly fine, but we're nearing the
22
23
   end of time that we have available for this proceeding.
24
   already pushed off another proceeding that was scheduled for
25
   eleven-thirty by forty-five minutes, which is fine, because
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

68

there was a lot of material for us to cover here today, but we also have multiple other cases, that's what I was just discussing with Ms. Brown, there are a lot of items that the Court needs to attend to today, so we're not a hundred percent at the end, but we're very close to the end, and in order for me to be able to make final determinations on these questions, I do need to know the answer to the question that I just asked you, which is, if I were to impose the conditions that were recommended by the Government, would you be able to comply with those conditions. 10 11 And if you'd like to take a minute to discuss that with Mrs. Wolfe, I recommend that you do that. 12 13 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you. 14 (Defendant consults Standby Counsel) 15 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Your Honor -- sorry. 16 THE COURT: That's okay. 17 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Your Honor, as I said, I will agree to whatever hard conditions you gave me, but conditions 18 that is on the face violating my constitutional rights, it's 19 20 only the condition that will cause irreversible harm, as the 21 Second Circuit already laid out that this is a different factor, irreversible harm, conditions for bail is always appealable, 22 23 whatever, so conditions like this is causing me irreversible 24 harm, then I'd rather go back to jail, your Honor. I would 25 rather go back to jail for another three years also. I'll go

```
back for another three years of jail.
 2
             If the Court really determine that they feel I deserve
   it, I trust you, I will go back to jail, your Honor, but --
 4
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, it's not a question of what you
   deserve or don't deserve, it is a legal standard that I am
   required to apply, and what I am trying to understand is
   whether...you claim that these conditions would present
   irreversible harm to you. That is your right to make that
   argument, and any decision I make, whether it is to detain you
   or release you subject to conditions, is appealable, so you can
10
   take that appeal and seek a de novo review of this bail decision
11
12
   by Judge Roman, whenever he's able to schedule you for that
13
  hearing.
14
             I understand that if I were to impose those
   conditions, you would not be happy with those conditions. I
15
   understand that. But what I think you've just said is that if I
16
17
   were to impose these conditions, you will not comply with them
   and that you would prefer to go back to jail rather than face
18
19
   this particular set of conditions.
20
             Is that correct?
21
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yeah, what I'm trying to say is
22
   those conditions harder make me more than --
23
             THE COURT: Than being in jail.
24
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: More, yes. It's more worse than
25
   in jail.
```

70

1 THE COURT: These conditions would be worse for you than being in jail and so if my decision is that the only way I 2 could release you would be subject to these conditions, then it would be your preference, in fact, to returning to jail because being in jail is less...onerous for you than being out of jail with these conditions. 7 Is that what you're saying? 8 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: For myself? 9 THE COURT: For yourself. 10 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: And for -- the, the reason why I would want to even return to jail is not to (inaudible) for 11 12 myself and for my Jewish community. 13 THE COURT: Okay. MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: My Jewish community has been 14 persecuted during centuries and those were what -- these were 15 16 the main arguments of everyone prosecuted, that they are 17 dangerous. That's exactly what I feel the Government trying to do. Label this community as dangerous, dangerous people, 18 kidnappers, child abusers, exactly same accusations that 19 20 followed us centuries upon centuries. And I can prove it, I'm ready to prove that. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay, and you'll have the opportunity to 23 prove that at your trial next month. 24 MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: But, but, but, your Honor, if

the Court really wants to make a decision, I -- your Honor, I

USA v. Malka, et al.

71

just gave you my whole review of the evidence that I want to I want the Court to allow me to prove that I don't need 2 those conditions. I'm not under section C, I'm under section B. I'm not under this section. I don't need those conditions. don't need -- there's no any reason for those conditions, it's unreasonable conditions, and I want the Court to allow me to 7 prove that. I believe this is my right. If it's not, tell me. 8 THE COURT: I understand your position. That, we have addressed. I am not going to continue this bail hearing to 9 10 allow the presentation of all of that evidence. That -- if you want to include that as part of your appeal of the 11 12 determination, you're welcome to do that as well. 13 Let me turn to you, Mr. Matityau Malka. 14 I want to be clear about this, because you've now heard everything that your cousin has had to say about the 15 merits of the case, from his perspective at least, and maybe 16 17 it's your perspective, too, but also his position with respect to the conditions, and I know I asked you this already, but I 18 want to be entirely comfortable and sure that I understand your 19 20 position. And before you answer, you should talk to Mr. Vita, but, again, I'm going to ask you the same question I asked you 21 earlier just to make sure that your position is no different now 22 23 than it was after you heard your cousin's presentation, and that 24 is, if I were to determine that these conditions proposed by the 25 Government are necessary in the Court's view to reasonably

USA v. Malka, et al.

assure your appearance and the safety of any person or the

community, would you abide by those conditions. 2 Talk to Mr. Vita for one second and then let me know. 3 4 (Defendant consults Standby Counsel) 5 THE COURT: Mr. Malka. 6 MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, your Honor, I just want to 7 make it one more time clear, that I know the Court has just asked me a yes-or-a-no answer, but the thing I just -- I'm adopting in all the arguments and the statements that my cousin 10 just did in full. This is one thing. 11 And the other thing is that I'm -- because all the 12 arguments that we already did now, how much it's possible in 13 this short hearing even was one (inaudible) subpoena a few other 14 witnesses and few other people that will for sure show for the Court that I am not a flight risk and dangerous for the 15 community, so one just... I was very much to make it clear to the 16 17 Court that even if it to be a \$500,000 secure bond or other very hard conditions that is not mention here that the Court can find 18 and to put it on me, I will obey it hundred percent and I will 19 20 not violate any state or federal or any kind of any law while I 21 am outside on bail, but just I think really what asking the Court because I'm suffering so much, that right now I'm 22 23 incarcerated already here in jail over three years, and not just 24 I am suffering from that, the minors, so-called alleged victims, 25 also suffering so much from them.

USA v. Malka, et al.

And especially my family, my mother, my father, and my 1 wife and my children, they couldn't stop to cry, with their 2 eyes, of all the abusing that's going already over here, over three years, from the Government and all the allegations what they are bringing down to the Court, everything is just false allegations based on newspapers and based of people they're trying to shrink (ph) up some information and to send it to the Government to prove our incarceration like Mr. Abraham Greenwald and his, and his other people that he's helping out for this 10 reason, just to break down our community humanity and physically, and I'm sure with the help of God, that the Court 11 12 hopefully will be able to put on me any other condition, even 13 500 secure bond -- \$500,000 secure bond or more co-signers and 14 real property or even any other very hard condition, but just here while I'm now in jail for the last three years, I was able 15 16 to talk to my whole community and I didn't violate any kind of 17 any rule and I didn't -- and I'm not kidnapping, I'm not attempt kidnapping, nothing, any violation I didn't do. 18 19 So if I was in jail for three years and all the phone 20 calls is recorded and the Government have access to it and the 21 Government didn't found nothing that I was getting involved, so why outside when my phones will be also recorded what can I do, 22 23 which kind of violation can I do more outside if my phone is 24 still the same recorded like jail and is sent directly to my 25 standby counsel, or if it's not an option, to Pre-Trial

```
Services, then they can have an option to review it one phone,
   one computer, limited everything, I'm agree with that. Even
   against my mind I will obey it, but just...
 4
             THE COURT: Let me just address a couple of those
 5
   points.
 6
             First, the circumstances are entirely different when
 7
   somebody is in jail versus out of jail in terms of what they're
   capable of doing, because when you're in jail, you're in jail.
   I mean, there's a fundamental difference between what you are
10
   capable of achieving in terms of potential flight or potential
   danger when you are not in custody. It's just -- it's, it's
11
   apples and oranges. It's an entirely different analysis.
12
13
   That's one point.
14
             And the other point, and you've mentioned this a few
   times now so I think it's worth just addressing briefly, the
15
   idea that the phone calls are recorded and therefore there would
16
   be some sort of investigative avenue available to the Government
17
   after the fact to pursue whatever may or may not happen as a
18
   result of those calls if they were for a nefarious purpose, it's
19
20
   not as though Mr. Ligtenberg and Mr. Adams are sitting at their
   desk listening to all of these phone calls. That's not how it
21
22
   works.
23
             I'm not sure what you envision in terms of the
24
  monitoring of these phone calls, but the Government doesn't have
25
   the capability to be real-time monitoring every single phone
```

```
75
   Bail Hearing
                         USA v. Malka, et al.
   call that's being recorded from every criminal defendant that's
   out there in the surround, that's just not how it works, so to
   suggest that that alone is a sufficient backstop to address the
   concerns that have been identified by the Government in this
   case is just not accurate. I understand the logic of your
   argument to some extent, but I think it just -- it reflects just
   a misapprehension of the resources and the capabilities of the
   Government to a certain degree.
 9
             But, look, we're at the two-hour, two-and-a-half-hour
10
   mark now of this hearing, we had a ten-minute recess at some
   point earlier today, but it is time for me to make rulings on
11
   these matters.
12
13
             I did see at one point, just briefly, Mr. Mordechay
14
  Malka, you seemed to be trying to get the attention of the
   interpreter while your cousin was speaking. Is there something
15
   you need to ask him to make sure you understand what is
16
   happening in this proceeding? Please take a moment to confer.
17
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Sorry.
18
             (Off-the-record discussion)
19
20
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: It's a letter, your Honor, from
   my five young children directly to the Court for today's
21
               They wrote it. It's directly in connection with
22
   proceeding.
```

your determination regarding my release or not. I feel I -- if

24 possible...

25

THE COURT: It's a letter from your children?

USA v. Malka, et al.

```
1
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: My five young children.
 2
             THE COURT: Asking for your release?
 3
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yes.
 4
             THE COURT: Okay, I certainly will take judicial
   notice of the fact that it will be your children's very strong
   preference to have you released, and as with many defendants who
   come before the Court on many different matters, the continued
   incarceration of a parent, loved one, sibling, child, close
   family relation is incredibly burdensome on a family.
   understand that. It is something that I think about in every
10
   proceeding that I conduct from this bench.
11
12
             With respect, it's not necessary for me to hear an
13
   entire letter from your children. I, I do appreciate -- I have
14
  no difficulty appreciating the difficult -- the challenges and,
   I'm sure, the absolute heartbreak that your family faces as a
15
   result of your incarceration. Regardless of whether you
16
17
   ultimately are convicted of these crimes with which you are
   charged or not, truly, it's undoubtedly an incredible burden on
18
   your family, just as it is for criminal defendants in all kinds
19
20
   of cases, so I don't need to hear that letter because I well
   understand that issue, but I thank you for raising it
21
22
   nonetheless.
23
             Mr. Malka, Mr. Matityau Malka, I imagine the same is
24
   true for your family as well, but go ahead.
25
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Sorry, your Honor, but just a
```

```
small thing for a minute.
 2
             Just my standby counsel already mentioned it in a
   letter to the Court, I just want to refresh it one more time,
 3
   that even the -- of the previous trial that it was, that was
   took away -- few seconds before the jury selection was took away
   the pro se status of the two defendants, so their standby
   counsels was not ready and to step in from a second to a second
   to proceeding the trial, so the Government trying to bring up to
   the Court a million of times that we already have in our hand a
   convicted...cases for sure will get convicted where there's a
10
   secure guilty plea, but at end of the day, the defendants who
11
12
   was get convicted, they was not have the ability to...bring out
13
   the evidence in the same way I am trying to do now, so if there
14
   is not any possibility to make a continuing because we already
   over two hours and a half, so I just want to say the conclusion
15
   of Judge Román was when the sentencing guidelines, the other
16
   defendants who was convicted was charged twice with parental
17
   abduction and each one carries a maximum of three years, so
18
19
   together is six years, but Judge Román con...
20
             (Defendant consults Standby Counsel)
21
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: He gave a concurrent sentence for
22
   three years for those two same counts.
23
             So I'm already here over -- almost -- over
24
   thirty-seven months and I'm willing to obey every condition, and
25
   I just hope that it would be possible to put any other condition
```

```
78
```

```
that is possible -- if there's no any possible to have it
   continued, I really requesting to a continue, but if there is no
   any possible to have a continuing date so at least if it's
   probable to put any -- even a hard condition, a very hard
   condition, and I will obey it full, just to take away the
   condition about to violate my religion.
 7
             THE COURT: Okay. I don't see that condition -- I
  mean, you keep representing it as the condition that violates
   your religion. I don't see it that way.
10
             And just to be clear, I've asked you this multiple
   times, but that last statement makes me want to ask you one
11
12
   final time, if I reject your request and impose the condition
13
   that you feel imposes on your religion, would you still abide by
   it even though you would be unhappy with it. Would you still
14
   follow it even though you'd be unhappy with it.
15
16
             (Brief pause)
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: I really want to make sure to
17
   the Court that I will obey every condition that the Court will
18
   impose on me, I'll obey it full, but just this condition about
19
20
   Lev Tahor, I'm really asking the Court if it's possible to put
21
   something --
22
             THE COURT: I understand that you're asking that, I
23
   really do, and, and defendants, usually through counsel, ask for
24
   conditions to be dropped or modified all the time. Okay, this
25
   one is special to you because it's your case and your condition,
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

```
but it's -- as a concept, it's very familiar to the Court, okay?
   So I understand that you are asking -- and you've made many
   arguments that I've heard today for why that condition shouldn't
   apply. I understand all of those arguments. But if I reject
   the arguments and I choose to impose this condition, is it still
   true that you'll comply with all of the conditions?
   that would be one of the conditions if I choose to go that way.
 8
             Will you still comply with that condition.
 9
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: I'll, I'll be able to obey every
10
   condition that the Court will impose on me, but just this
   condition, I'm really asking that --
11
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, you have to be able to answer
12
13
   this question without ending the sentence by saying "but." You
14
   have to either be able to answer the question by saying you will
   comply, period, or "that condition is just too much and I can't
15
16
   possibly do it, I can do anything else, but I can't possibly do
17
   that," because if it's the second, you can't possibly do that,
   then you might be in the same situation as Mr. Mordechay Malka
18
   who has essentially said that he cannot comply with that
19
20
   condition and that, much as he would prefer in a general sense
21
   to be released, he can't abide by that condition and therefore
   understands that if I were to deem that necessary, he would have
22
23
   to go back to jail.
24
             So this will be the last time I ask you to try to
   answer this question cleanly and clearly, without saying "but,"
25
```

```
without a further argument about it: if I were to impose that
   condition, meaning the condition that you cannot directly or
   indirectly associate or have contact with any individual
   currently or formerly associated with Lev Tahor except for those
   individuals who you list for the Government and the Government
   and Pre-Trial Services don't object to, if I were to impose that
 7
   condition, could you comply with it, yes or no.
 8
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: I don't see any way how I'll be
   able because I'm believing that this is, this is harmed my
10
   defense because I must prepare for trial and this will be hard
   for my defense, so I don't see any way how I'll be able to be
11
12
   prepare for trial by restricting not to talk to Lev Tahor, so I
13
   don't see any way --
14
             THE COURT: You will have the ability to contact your
   co-defendants and contact people from Lev Tahor in a restricted,
15
16
   but not prohibited way. I thought -- heh. If the answer is you
   can't do it, then that's the answer, but that's, that's not what
17
   you've been saying for the last two hours. That's not what Mr.
18
   Vita represented that you were prepared to say here today.
19
20
             This feels like we're going backwards, Mr. Malka.
   feels like we're going back to where you were in October, and if
21
22
   that's the case, then fine, but you have to be clear with me
23
   about it now.
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: I think I --
24
25
             THE COURT: But just to be clear, in October, before
```

```
Judge Román, when he ultimately concluded that you had said you
   couldn't comply with the conditions, you tried to back away from
   that, despite everything that you had just said to Judge Román.
   I've given you many opportunities to be clear with me about what
   your intentions are, and so if you are going to say that you
   cannot comply with these conditions if I were to impose them,
   there's not going to be any going back.
 8
             Because I really have been trying to give you every
   opportunity to let them know that you would be able to comply
10
   with these conditions, that was my understanding coming into
   this proceeding today, you've said that, in fact, at different
11
12
   points during this proceeding, but here at the very last minute,
13
   two hours and forty minutes into this hearing, you seem to be
14
   hesitating, and so it's essential that I know now once and for
   all so I can make a final, final decision, which you can then
15
   appeal, but I need to know what your answer is to this question.
16
17
             I'm going to give you thirty seconds to talk to Mr.
   Vita just so it can be completely clear what the stakes are in
18
19
   terms of the answer to that question. Okay, do that, please.
20
             (Defendant consults Standby Counsel)
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Your Honor --
21
22
             THE COURT: Hold on.
23
             (Defendant consults Standby Counsel)
24
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, Mr. Matityau Malka...
25
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes. I think I cannot see any
```

```
82
```

```
way how I'll be able.
 2
             THE COURT: You cannot see how you'll be able to
   comply with those conditions. Is that what you're saying?
 3
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Just with this condition with --
 4
 5
             THE COURT: Right, with the conditions that we've been
   focused on, about not contacting the co-defendants and not
   contacting Lev Tahor.
 8
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, but beside that, every,
   every other condition --
10
             THE COURT: I understand that. Okay.
11
             Mr. Mordechay Malka.
12
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Yes, your Honor, sorry. I feel
13
   there is left out, there is one point that's missing here that's
14
   very important for the Court to know.
15
             As I saw in the -- I mean, many cases, for example,
   United States v. Markier (ph), Second Circuit, so it says that a
16
   defendant is obligated to challenge the Government's proffer.
17
   If he's not challenging it, it is accepted -- being accepted as
18
   true, and, for example, saying Markier's failure to quote here
19
20
   on page eleven --
21
             THE COURT: Mr. Malka, you don't have to quote the
   case; you have absolutely challenged the Government's proffer.
22
23
   You have. There's no default finding here that the Government's
24
  proffer is true because of a failure to challenge it.
  not the situation we have.
25
```

```
1
             I appreciate the point, I understand what that case is
   about, but you haven't sat quietly by and failed to challenge
 2
   the proffer. I have not allowed you to present all of the
   evidence that you requested to present in all of its different
   forms, but that does not mean that you have not challenged the
   Government's proffer. You absolutely have challenged it.
   doesn't mean that I have to agree with your arguments either,
   but this is not a case where you've waived your arguments.
   Certainly.
10
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Okay, I understand that, thank
   you, Your Honor, but one thing on the other side is that one
11
12
   point that I didn't make is the Government is obligated to prove
13
   dangerous, dangerous by clear and convincing evidence, they --
   this is their burden of proof, and --
14
15
             THE COURT: Well, I certainly understand that.
16
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: And, your Honor, my argument
   will be not only they didn't prove it by clear and convincing
17
18
   evidence, they didn't provide any evidence at all.
19
             THE COURT: Okay.
20
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: They're saying a speech or
   providing a submission is not evidence, your Honor.
21
22
             THE COURT: I understand.
23
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: I did provide evidence and I
24
   wanted to provide evidence.
25
             THE COURT: I understand all of that.
```

USA v. Malka, et al.

```
MR. MORDECHAY MALKA:
 1
                                    So --
 2
             THE COURT: I do.
 3
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: All right.
 4
             THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Malka.
 5
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT:
                        All right, Mr. Ligtenberg...I, I take it
 7
   that the Government's position here, having heard everything
   we've heard for this lengthy hearing, is that the defendants,
   Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka, are not prepared to comply with the
10
   conditions that the Government has proposed if the Court were to
   accept all of those conditions.
11
12
             Is that right?
13
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
14
             THE COURT:
                        Okay.
15
             All right, that's my understanding, too, based on the
16
   various colloquies we've had here today, so let me go through
17
   and issue my findings here today.
             I'm going to start with Mr. Mordechay Malka whose
18
   situation is a bit different because this is a first bail
19
20
   hearing for Mr. Mordechay Malka.
21
             Mr. Malka, in making a bail determination, I must
   consider the following factors that I alluded to earlier: the
22
23
   nature and circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of
24
   the evidence against you, your history and characteristics, and
25
   the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or to the
```

community that would be posed by your release. 2 As you just pointed out accurately, the Government bears the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that you are a danger to the community or establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that you are a flight risk. In this case, I find that the Government has met its burdens of establishing that there are no conditions that I can impose that will reasonably assure your appearance and the safety of the community. I make that decision based on all of the information that has been presented to me, including the Pre-Trial Services 10 report, the arguments and information provided by Counsel and by 11 12 yourself in your pro se capacity, and in considering all of the 13 factors set forth in Title 18 U.S. Code § 3142(g). The nature and circumstances of the offense charged 14 here are serious. 15 16 I understand that you, Mr. Malka, have a very different view of what actually occurred in this set of 17 18 circumstances that led to the charges in the indictment, and I'm 19 sure that you will do all that you can to present those 20 arguments at your trial coming up next month, but the nature and 21 circumstances of the offenses charged here are very serious and weigh in favor of detention. 22 23 The weight of the evidence against you as proffered by 24 the Government, you know, you've put forward a lot of arguments 25 as to why the weight of the evidence against you is not

The Government takes the position that the particularly strong. weight of the evidence is strong. We have not engaged in a lengthy recitation or presentation of evidence. I've accepted proffers from both sides about the weight of the evidence, and I am not going to rely on the weight of the evidence as an element of the decision here, although the fact -- despite your arguments about what was and wasn't allowed to be presented at the prior trial, the fact that there is a prior conviction of co-conspirators in this case suggests that, at least with 10 respect to those defendants, the weight of the evidence was strong, but, again, you have a presumption of innocence, you'll 11 be having a separate trial with a separate jury, and you'll be 12 13 entitled to your own determination from that jury as to your 14 quilt or innocence. 15 Ultimately, this is not a case where the -- turning to 16 history and characteristics, this is not a case where the defendants have any criminal history, there's no indication of 17 participation in criminal activity while on probation, parole, 18 or supervision, but we do have some significant issues that come 19 20 up in the history-and-characteristics prong that weigh in favor of detention. 21 22 Mr. Malka has limited ties to the United States, his 23 close family and religious community, as he's described, are 24 located abroad in Guatemala, the crimes at issue in this case 25 involve border crossings that, at least in the Government's

USA v. Malka, et al.

87

proffer, have not yet been completely understood. There is some indication/evidence here as part of this conspiracy about an 2 unwillingness to follow court orders or willingness to defy court orders. I do understand that there arguments about whether those orders should come into play here or not, but nevertheless, there is a lot here that points to risk of flight 7 for Mr. Malka. The opportunity to flee, the availability of communities abroad, all are factors that heavily weigh in favor of detention on flight grounds. Now, the fact that Mr. Malka came here voluntarily to 10 face trial is a fact that weighs in his favor on the 11 risk-of-flight grounds. Yet, still, everything that I've heard 12 13 here today about his ties to his community in Guatemala and his, 14 his...lack of ties to the United States and the strong, strong desire to be reunited with that community, very much weigh in 15 16 favor of detention, and the Government has certainly met its 17 burden to prove risk of flight by a preponderance of the evidence. 18 I alluded to the sentencing calculations earlier as a 19 20 potential factor that would weigh against the flight determination and that is a factor that I have considered. 21 fact that Mr. Malka has spent...years in prison or in custody 22 23 already pending these charges is certainly -- and the amount of 24 sentencing exposure that he faces, even if he is convicted, is 25 reduced by that reality. However, the arguments about...well,

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's not enough to overcome all of the other factors that I've just alluded to with respect to the risk of flight. 3 As far as danger to the community, there is a very strong insistence here by Mr. Malka that whatever happened with respect to the minor victims in this case was actually done for the protection of those minor victims. 7 Now, how that will play out at trial is a different matter, but how that plays out from the perspective of danger to the community is it gives the Court great pause, to know that 10 there's at least an ongoing and, clearly, very strongly and deeply-held view that the actions taken by the alleged 11 12 co-conspirators in this case were for the benefit of these 13 alleged victims, and it does strongly suggest that further harm 14 could come to those victims, potentially, if there were to be -if Mr. Malka were to be released on, on...in this case. 15 What is unusual about this matter and what has been 16

What is unusual about this matter and what has been the subject of most of our discussion here today is that the Government has proposed a set of conditions that it believes would be sufficient to ensure the appearance of Mr. Malka and the safety of the community. And those conditions are undoubtedly strict, there's no question about that; I don't think anyone would dispute that. I don't think Mr. Ligtenberg would even dispute that. However, those conditions certainly would have given the Court comfort that Mr. Malka could be released and it would reasonably assure the safety of the

```
community and Mr. Malka's appearance in court.
                                                    There is clearly
   a path forward to that here today, but Mr. Malka has made clear
   in his statements that he would not be able to abide by the
   conditions that were proposed by the Government, and the Court
   finds that those conditions would be reasonable conditions to
   impose, given all of the unusual facts and circumstances here.
 7
             And Mr. Malka has said quite plainly that he would not
  be able to comply with those conditions and, in fact, it would
   be less onerous for him to remain in jail, you know, adding to
10
   the list of things that I have not ever heard before sitting
   here on the bench, that that's one of them, but that is clearly
11
12
   Mr. Malka's firmly-held and honestly-held belief, and he's been
13
   very candid with the Court about that and I respect the candor
14
   at least.
15
             So for all of those reasons, I find that there is no
   condition or combination of conditions that I could impose that
16
   would be -- that the defendant, Mr. Malka, would be able to
17
   comply with that would reasonably assure the defendant, Mr.
18
   Malka's, appearance and the safety of the community and
19
20
   accordingly, Mr. Malka will remain in custody pending trial on
   May 18th.
21
22
             With respect to Mr. Matityau Malka, the determinations
23
  have already been made as to Mr. Malka's...danger to the
24
   community and risk of flight by both Judge Román and Judge
25
   McCarthy. I adopt all of those findings. Nothing that has
```

happened in the intervening months has changed any of those factors that led both Judge McCarthy and Judge Román to conclude that Mr. Malka, this is Matityau Malka, was a danger to the community or his release would pose a danger to the community or there was a risk that he would not appear for his court proceedings. 7 Again, there is a set of conditions that the Government has proposed. This was true in the October 2021 hearing before Judge Román. There was a set of conditions that 10 was proposed. As was the case with Mordechay Malka, it is an onerous and burdensome set of conditions. However, these are 11 12 conditions that the Court would have adopted and would have put 13 in place for Matityau Malka and would have enabled Matityau Malka to be released on bond. 14 15 An hour ago or so, I thought that Mr. Matityau Malka was prepared to accept those conditions, not happily, not 16 17 willingly, but that he was certainly willing to abide by the conditions despite his strong objection to them, but it is clear 18 from the latest colloquy that he is simply not prepared to 19 20 accept conditions with respect to contact with co-defendants, being in the presence of standby counsel in a language that 21 22 standby counsel can understand, and limitations on contact with 23 members of the Lev Tahor community. 24 And so as a result of that, I must again conclude, as 25 Judge Román did before me, that because Mr. Malka is not

```
prepared to comply with these conditions, then I am not able to
   authorize his release subject to these conditions because
   there's no reason for the Court to believe that Mr. Malka would
   comply with those conditions, and accordingly, having adopted
   the findings of Judge McCarthy and Judge Román with respect to
   risk of flight and danger to the community and understanding Mr.
   Malka's continued unwillingness to comply at least with those
   specific conditions that I've referenced, I am going to require
   that he return to custody as well pending trial.
             Of course, as we've talked about multiple times
10
   throughout today's proceeding, both Mr. Malka and Mr. Malka have
11
12
   the right to appeal this decision and seek further review of
13
   this decision by Judge Román, and that application can be made
   at the appropriate time.
14
15
             All right, I believe that concludes our business here
16
   today.
             Mr. Ligtenberg, is there anything further we should
17
   address now from the Government's perspective?
18
19
             MR. LIGTENBERG: No, thank you, Your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Thank you.
21
             Mr. Matityau Malka, is there anything further we
22
   should address from your perspective today?
23
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: Briefly.
25
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Yes, I just want to ask the Court
```

```
92
```

```
if it's possible to expedite this whole proceeding on transcript
  because usually we are waiting, like, four or five months for
   each transcripts and if it's possible to have it expedite in a
   few days? Because --
 5
             THE COURT: Yes, that's a reasonable request, Mr.
  Malka.
 7
             Mr. Ligtenberg, can the Government please order the
   transcript of this proceeding forthwith and have it turned
   around for delivery tomorrow?
             MR. LIGTENBERG: Yeah, assuming that works for --
10
11
             THE COURT: For the court reporter.
12
             I mean, the earliest convenience possible for the
13
   court reporter, which I think would be next day, which means
14
   that the Government would have the -- should be able to have it,
   assuming the resources are available from the court reporters to
15
   have it prepared tomorrow. It's a long proceeding and...there's
16
17
   been a lot of talking, so it's possible that that might slip
   till the middle of the week, but certainly this week, it should
18
  be able to be provided to standby counsel.
19
20
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
             THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Malka? At this
         Mr. Malka, is there anything else that you'd like to
22
23
   raise at this time? Matityau Malka?
24
             MR. MATITYAU MALKA: No, I just...
25
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
```

```
1
             Mr. Mordechay Malka, anything further that you would
 2
  like to raise at this time?
 3
             MR. MORDECHAY MALKA: No, thank you, Your Honor.
 4 Thank you.
             THE COURT: Okay, thank you, everybody. We'll stand
 6 adjourned for today. Stay safe and stay healthy, everyone.
  Take care.
 8
  Certified to be a true and accurate
10 transcript of the digital electronic
11 recording to the best of my ability.
12
13 Tabitha R. Dente, RMR, CRR
14 U.S. District Court
15 Official Court Reporter
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```